



## Library Committee

Tuesday 23 May 2023, 2.00pm

Video-conferencing meeting via MS Teams

### Minutes

#### Present Members:

Professor Vivek Mudera (Chair); Hamza Ahmed [Minutes 1-7]; Dr Paul Ayriss; Dr Nicole Brown [Minutes 8-12]; Professor Duncan Brumby; Professor Ben Cox; Dr Liza Griffin; Professor Rebecca Lever; Martin Moyle; Professor John Sabapathy; Dr Benet Salway; Dr Harriet Shannon; Thomas Turner [Minutes 1-7]

#### Apologies:

Professor Simon Banks; Professor Tom Carlson; Dr Charles Inskip; Professor Diane Koenker; Andy Smith

#### Officer:

Rachel Port, Governance Manager: Research Integrity

### Part I: Preliminary Business

#### 1. Welcome

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed Dr Nicole Brown, Institute of Education, and Professor Rebecca Lever, Faculty of Life Sciences, to their first meeting of the Committee.

#### 2. Minutes

- 2.1. The minutes of the Library Committee (LC) meeting held on 7 February 2023, as well as the minutes of this meeting, would be available for LC to approve at its first meeting next session to be held on 3 November 2023.

#### 3. Matters Arising

- 3.1. There were no matters arising.

## Part II: Strategic Items for Discussion

### 4. Report of the Pro-Vice-Provost (UCL Library, Culture, Collections and Open Science (LCCOS)) (3-01)

4.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (LCCOS) introduced the paper setting out an update on performance against the current Key Performance Areas of the Library Strategy since the last LC meeting. The following points were made during the presentation:

- a. UCL had performed extremely well in the National Student Survey (NSS) results over the past two years and was above the sector average at 77.6% in 2022 in relation to questions about Library Resources.
- b. Two LCCOS staff/teams had been shortlisted for the Provost's Educational Awards in the category Openness and Inclusion and the winners would be announced at a ceremony in early June.
- c. There had been an improvement in online reading lists active which had reached 75% but further work was needed to reach the benchmark of 80%.
- d. In terms of benchmarking the performance of UCL Library against national benchmarks, UCL was performing strongly. In terms of total information spend per FTE student, UCL wished to protect the spend on resources as far as possible. Other libraries outperformed UCL as, for example, Oxbridge centrally funded its libraries well, which posed a challenge to maintain the student experience locally.
- e. There had been significant developments in relation to Open Access and Open Science through Transformative Agreements. Such Agreements created an inequitable system which favoured richer countries. Jisc was proposing to look again at the role of such Agreements, which was strongly supported by UCL.
- f. The European Council had published today its Conclusion on Open Science in Europe. This body was still very influential even though the UK was no longer part of the EU. It advocated a not-for-profit system whereby the infrastructures were publicly owned and free at point of use for both readers and authors.
- g. LERU were minded to debate the EU Council report conclusions and, if implemented, the impacts on the current Open Science landscape would be profound.

4.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

- a. The Chair extended his thanks to the Pro-Vice-Provost and LCCOS for their NSS performance, given UCL investment in the Library was lower than at other institutions.
- b. It was commented that the Library supported other countries by hosting Open Access material on UCL Discovery which had achieved a massive global impact of 36 million downloads.

- c. In relation to UCL's Bicentennial celebrations planned for 2026, it was noted that the Pro-Vice-Provost and the Vice-Provost (RIGE) were keen to highlight the importance of Open Access and the Library's role in that area. It was suggested that its high NSS scores as well as the 36 million downloads from UCL Discovery also be especially highlighted.
- d. In relation to the impact of Open Access on the library landscape, it was noted that there were different pricing structures between online and hard copy versions of textbooks.
- e. It was commented that publishers were keen to generate as much income as possible, but there was no justification as to why an electronic version should be more expensive than a print version.
- f. The Library Community had approached the Competition Commission to consider the matter, but it was not considered to be a priority. Therefore, UCL had continued to develop its own e-print services.
- g. It was commented that the issue of open peer review be considered alongside how research was disseminated. It could also be integrated into the academic staff promotion process to raise the importance of Open Access and Open Research. It was noted that a paper on open peer review in the publishing process would be covered at the next LC meeting.
- h. In response to a query, it was intended that the draft LCCOS Strategy include coverage of Digital First.

4.3. LC received the Pro-Vice-Provost (LCCOS) report.

## **5. Developing the LCCOS Strategy (3-02)**

- 5.1. The Director of Services introduced the paper setting out the process for developing the LCCOS Strategy 2023-27 and anticipated strategic priorities for LCCOS in this period. The following points were made during the presentation:
  - a. An LCCOS Strategy was under development for launch in Autumn 2023 to align with the UCL Strategic Plan 2022-27. It would be the first Strategy for the enlarged LCCOS department.
  - b. It was intended that the LCCOS Leadership Team oversee the preparation of the next Strategy that would be developed consultatively and in conjunction with LCCOS users.
  - c. The Team was currently reviewing the outcomes of an all-staff consultation with LCCOS colleagues. Further consultation would take place in the June-October period and a final version of the Strategy would be presented at the next LC meeting for formal approval.
  - d. In terms of expected priorities, the future vision for arts and culture across would need to be considered.
  - e. Students continued to demand more study space in Bloomsbury and it would be necessary to review the balance between collections and study spaces at the larger central UCL libraries.

- f. It was intended to make all UCL's research-promoting audio and video outputs including podcasts more visible and to disseminate them to a wider audience.
  - g. The storage, interpretation and display of the Museum collections needed investment, and increased gallery and exhibition space for the LCCOS collections would be sought.
- 5.2. The following points were raised in discussion:
- a. It was noted that individuals could continue to visit UCL's Museums and Collections in person. However, while digital collecting would have resource implications, the collections could then be made available globally.
  - b. In terms of increasing student learning spaces, it was suggested that the reduction of staff space or larger print collections for example could also be considered.
  - c. Physical collections remained important and relevant academic colleagues would be involved in determining the hard copies that could go to stores and those that should be kept at the Library. It was noted that the Library would not take unilateral action in this area.
  - d. The environmental implications of digital collecting were noted and the Library intended to liaise with Jisc over expectations in the area.
- 5.3. LC received the report on the development of the proposed LLCOS Strategy.

## **6. Content Warnings for Library Resources (3-03)**

- 6.1. The Director of Services introduced the paper summarising LCCOS approaches to address the use of potentially offensive terminology and/or ideas in UCL library cataloguing systems. The following points were made during the presentation:
- a. UCL's historical archive collections were generally closed and under Library control. Where they could contain offensive and outdated ideas and terminology, wherever possible, a modern term was used when describing them in UCL's archives. However, in some cases discredited terminology was quoted directly in the catalogue.
  - b. In light of this, two mitigatory actions had recently been developed. First, a glossary had been created that provided information on the outdated/offensive terms found in catalogue. Second, the Archives team had designed warning statements for use in different parts of the archive catalogue.
  - c. In relation to books, content issues were more challenging to address than in the archives. UCL owned or licensed book titles in their millions and there was much more room for subjectivity. UCL was following consensus amongst Russell Group libraries that it was not possible for libraries to apply a content warning approach to individual books.

- d. In relation to reading lists, it was noted that there was nothing in principle to prevent a lecturer from annotating a reading list as an act of care towards relevant students.
- e. It was noted that UCL was still establishing a position with regard to the use of content warnings in teaching.

6.2. LC endorsed the overall approaches to warnings for each type of content as outlined at Paper 3-03.

## **7. Special Collections Developments (3-04)**

- 7.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (LCCOS) introduced the paper setting out current developments in UCL Special Collections. The following points were made during the presentation:
- a. It was intended that one main theme in the proposed LCCOS Strategy would be the development of a pan-UCL approach to managing its Special Collections.
  - b. UCL's Special Collections were currently stored in a siloed environment at The National Archives (TNA) located in Kew. UCL had agreed a further 10 year contract with the TNA, with the option to extend for a further 5 years.
  - c. The Special Collections contained over 10,000 metres of rare books, archives and manuscripts. However, a way forward for the storage of Special Collections in the long-term needed to be devised. It was considered preferable to bring the Collections back to Bloomsbury, as it was impossible to take a large class of students to the TNA to do object-based learning.
  - d. One possible solution was to create a Special Collections Centre in Bloomsbury. Work had started by institutions in the federal University of London to create this collaborative shared space, to be housed in the Senate House footprint. A Working Group co-chaired by the Pro-Vice-Provost (LCCOS) and a representative of Senate House Library had been established to develop this shared facility for special collections in Bloomsbury.
  - e. It was intended to invite Professor Jo Cox, Pro Vice Chancellor (Research and Engagement) and Dean, School of Advanced Study, University of London, to a future LC meeting to talk about the ideas being considered by the group and possible solutions.
  - f. A number of detailed brainstorm sessions were taking place to look at particular issues. Suggestions included: approaching a business planner or philanthropist for financial resources; and working with the Office of the Vice-President (Advancement) to raise the profile of culture and heritage more widely.
  - g. Work continued on developing the operational plan for the new UCL Research Institute for Collections. It had made three fellowships available this year, the Special Collections Visiting Fellowship and two as Liberating

the Collections Fellowships, that had attracted a number of high calibre applications.

- 7.2. The following points were raised in discussion:
- a. In relation to the exposure to UCL's Special Collections for new students as part of their induction process, it was noted that the scope of this work could be enlarged and better promoted.
  - b. In response to the suggestion of holding a special event or conference to showcase UCL's Special Collections material, it was intended that some pan-UCL exhibitions and travelling exhibitions be curated as part of UCL's Bicentennial celebrations.
  - c. In relation to the robustness of Senate House as a potential partner in a collaboration with UCL, it was noted that it had had a high turnover of staff in recent years.
- 7.3. LC received the report on Special Collections developments.

## **8. LCCOS Planning for UCL East Phase 2 (3-05)**

- 8.1. The Pro-Vice-Provost (LCCOS) introduced the paper setting out possible developments for LCCOS provision under UCL East Phase 2. The following points were made during the presentation:
- a. A number of LCCOS areas of potential interest had been identified around: additional study spaces; Special Collections; Studio space; Citizen science space; and Museum space.
  - b. It was suggested that more study space was required, given the growing student population at UCL East and to help maintain a 1:8 ratio (study space:students).
  - c. UCL East could hold collections around London Social History and expansion space for collections to enable collection-based education and research. This would also complement the collaborative work with Senate House Library.
  - d. There was a chronic shortage of studio space for theatre classes/performances at UCL. More space for a number of UCL East-based programmes and to support the Student Life Strategy could be run through LCCOS.
  - e. It was considered that UCL East offered tremendous potential to create a flexible space for exhibitions and engagement that was usable by the whole UCL East community.
  - f. In terms of Museums and Collections, it was considered that there were opportunities to lift and shift that could be explored given the challenges of the existing estate in Bloomsbury. More space would also allow UCL to display and market these areas of cultural heritage better.
- 8.2. The following points were raised in discussion:

- a. It was noted that the development of more spaces at UCL East could be beneficial for Museums and Collections to allow people from outside UCL, such as tourists that were also visiting the Olympic Park, to visit the collections.
- b. It was suggested that whilst UCL East was an attractive base for future LCCOS developments, UCL's collection materials were considered to fit better with Bloomsbury, given the proximity to the British Museum.
- c. At this stage, LCCOS was examining the pros and cons of further developments at UCL East.

8.3. LC received the report on LCCOS Planning for UCL East Phase 2.

### **Part III: Other Business for Approval or Information**

#### **9. Project Bidding in UCL Library Services (3-06)**

9.1. LC received the report on project bidding in UCL Library Services.

#### **10. Reports from Working Groups (3-07)**

- 10.1. Since the last meeting, LC officers had received the Minutes of the following Working Groups that report to LC:
- a. Bibliometrics Working Group – 1<sup>st</sup> March 2023 (confirmed).
  - b. Bibliometrics Working Group – 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2023 (unconfirmed).
  - c. Open Science and Scholarship Committee – 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2023 (confirmed).
  - d. Open Science and Scholarship Committee – 27<sup>th</sup> April 2023 (unconfirmed).
  - e. Press and Publications Board – 16<sup>th</sup> February 2023 (confirmed).

#### **11. Report from Faculty Library Committees (3-08)**

- 11.1. Since the last meeting, LC officers had received the Minutes of the following Faculty Library Committees (FLCs) or Faculty-level committee that consider Library matters:
- a. School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES) Library Committee – 19<sup>th</sup> October 2022 (confirmed).

#### **12. Remote Access to UCL Library Service Digital resources**

12.1. Under "Any Other Business", it was noted that the issue of remote access by retired members of UCL staff to digital material has been raised at a meeting of the Social and Historical Sciences FLC, who were encountering ongoing difficulties in accessing this material.

12.2. In response, the following points were raised:

- a. The Library was aware of this issue and it was linked to whether the retiree retained Emeritus status or not, given publisher restrictions on who could be considered an 'authorised user'.
- b. Publishers followed the Jisc one-size-fits-all model that determined that unless the retiree had Emeritus status, they could not have access to digital resources remotely. However, such staff could still have digital access to the materials in person on site.
- c. It noted that the Open University had a dedicated person who retirees could contact to obtain access to such material and advice would be sought on how they approached this issue.

12.3. LC:

- a. Agreed that the Pro-Vice-Provost (LCCOS) approach the Open University about their approach to remote digital access to its online resources for its retired academic staff.

**13. Dates for LC meetings in 2023-24 session**

- 13.1. Subsequent to the meeting, the dates for LC meetings in 2023-24 were confirmed as follows:

Friday 3 November 2023, 2.00pm - 4.00pm  
Tuesday 6 February 2024, 2.00pm - 4.00pm  
Thursday 23 May 2024, 2.00pm – 4.00pm.

All meetings to be held hybrid in the Council Room.

Rachel Port  
Acting LC Secretary  
October 2023