



LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Friday 26 November 2010

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Professor Michael Worton (Chair)
Dr Paul Ayris
Mr Michael Chessum
Dr Caroline Essex
Professor Adrian Forty
Ms Caroline Hibbs
Professor Richard North
Professor Philip Schofield
Professor Hans van Wees

In attendance:

Mr Gary Hawes (Secretary)

Apologies for absence were received from Dr Mike Cope, Professor David Price and Dr Hilary Richards.

Key to abbreviations

AB	Academic Board
FLC	Faculty Library Committee
ILCOAb	International Library Coalition for Open Access Books
LC	Library Committee
MHCPC	Museums, Heritage and Cultural Property Committee
SHL	Senate House Library
SMT	Senior Management Team
UoL	University of London

1 CONSTITUTION AND 2010-11 MEMBERSHIP; TERMS OF REFERENCE

Received:

- 1.1 At APPENDIX LC 1-01 (10-11), details of the constitution, 2010-11 membership and terms of reference of LC.

Noted:

- 1.2 Mr Michael Chessum had joined LC for 2010-11 as the newly elected UCL Union Education and Campaigns Officer.

- 1.3 Professor Philip Schofield had joined LC for 2010-11 as the Nominated representative of the Faculty of Laws.
- 1.4 Professor Hans van Wees had joined LC for 2010-11 as the Nominated representative of the Faculty of Social and Historical Sciences.
- 1.5 Dr Andrew Wills had joined LC for 2010-11 as the non-professorial academic staff member elected by and from the elected non-professorial academic staff members of AB.

Reported:

- 1.6 The Chair of LC welcomed the new members present to their first meeting of LC.
- 1.7 It was reported that since LC's last meeting, there had been various further discussions within the Provost's SMT concerning the best ways of engendering communication, discussion and decision-making regarding Library matters. Out of these discussions, proposals had emerged for how it should be possible to achieve greater functionality, transparency and communication concerning Library matters (see Minute 7 below). In light of this, the proposal to disestablish LC as part of the review of UCL committees that had taken place during the latter half of 2009-10 had been withdrawn until further notice.

2 MINUTES¹

Approved:

- 2.1 The Minutes of the LC meeting held on 24 May 2010 [*LC Mins. 24-34, 2009-10*] were confirmed by LC and signed by the Chair.

3 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

[see also Minutes 5, 6 & 6A below]

3A Library Committee Annual Report 2009-10

Noted:

- 3A.1 LC was charged by its terms of reference to submit to AB annually (or at such frequency as AB may direct), for subsequent submission to Council, a written report of recent activities and developments within its purview.
- 3A.2 At its previous meeting on 24 May 2010, LC noted that the LC Annual Report 2009-10, which had been approved by the Chair of LC acting on behalf of LC, would be submitted to UCL Council via AB for formal approval. The LC Annual Report 2009-10 was formally approved by AB and Council at their meetings on 27 May 2010 and 6 July 2010 respectively.

¹ Minutes of meetings of LC were available online at <http://ucl.ac.uk/staff/committees/library-committee/>.

4 **ELECTRONIC MONOGRAPH PUBLISHING**

Received:

- 4.1 A presentation by Ms Frances Pinter of Bloomsbury Academic on the ILCOAb proposed new business model for funding sustainable open access for scholarly books and monographs.

Reported:

- 4.2 The following points were raised during Ms Pinter's presentation:
- The ILCOAb model proposed to build on existing library consortia to create a consortium that would aggregate funds from library budgets with a view to purchasing upfront fixed first copy rights to scholarly books and monographs;
 - The model envisaged ILCOAb working with publishers to enable full free-to-end-user open access to selected scholarly book titles globally. In addition to helping to make better use of funds that were already available to libraries, the model would also offer libraries a simple and economic way of purchasing large volumes of quality content, while allowing greater control of selection and making a significant contribution to improving global scholarly communications;
 - For scholars, the benefits of the model would include continued access to the expertise of publishers, better discoverability and full open access to their work;
 - The model would also allow publishers to provide academics and library communities with sought-after service and to focus their activities on providing added-value.

Discussion:

- 4.3 The Chair of LC thanked Ms Pinter for her informative and thought-provoking presentation and invited LC members to raise any questions. The following points were raised during discussion:
- There would need to be further research and stakeholder discussion to agree some of the finer operational details of the ILCOAb model, such as organisation of consortia and the level of subscription fees for libraries wishing to sign up to these, and the process for making decisions on which scholarly book titles to purchase (including the level of information library consortia would require on scholarly book titles in order to inform their purchasing decisions). However, some members of LC noted that university research libraries were already used to the idea of purchasing book titles in certain fields as and when they came out regardless of whether or not they were pre-requested by users and without seeking further information on the titles in question;
 - Although the ILCOAb model envisaged the purchase of first-copy electronic versions of book titles, thereby conceptually untying digital from print, it would not preclude the purchase of print copies under the model;

- One of the big advantages of the ILCOAb model was that it would enable real (and faster) access to scholarly titles globally in greater numbers and more languages than ever before in spite of the diminishing resource of library budgets in the current economic climate;
- As well as helping to alleviate the impact of rising year-on-year journal subscriptions on library book budgets, the model would also help to reduce library expenditure on space costs and give university libraries greater and more visible power in their dealings with publishers;
- There might be possibilities for operating the ILCOAb model as part of a semi-for-profit venture involving tried-and-trusted publishing companies or internet-based organisations such as Google or Mozilla that would help to facilitate open access arrangements. However, there would need to be further consideration given to the possibility of these collaborations in order to ensure that responsibility for decision-making was clearly invested in member libraries.

5 SENATE HOUSE LIBRARY DEVELOPMENTS

[LC Min.26, 2009-10]

Received:

- 5.1 Oral reports from the Chair of LC and the Director of UCL Library Services.

Reported:

- 5.2 The Chair of LC and the Director of UCL Library Services drew attention to the following in their oral reports:
- There had been no further news or developments regarding the long-term future of SHL since LC's previous meeting;
 - Discussions between the Director of UCL Library Services and the Director of the SHL had raised the possibility of giving access and borrowing rights to the libraries of the Institutes of the School of Advanced Study to UCL taught course students (currently access to these libraries was only available to postgraduate research students). The SHL was currently given consideration to this.

Discussion:

- 5.3 The following points were raised during discussion:
- It would be helpful if LC members could gather feedback from their faculty/department constituencies on whether or not i) the SHL was still regarded as providing a valuable service for their staff and students and ii) there had been any noticeable reduction in the level of service since the implementation of the refocusing option. It was noted that in the absence of any evidence to suggest that there had been a reduction in the level of service provided by the SHL, it would be difficult for UCL to justify any move to reduce its subscription payments to the UoL;

- UCL students had hitherto tended to regard SHL as a useful resource because it duplicated a number of the UCL collections and also because it provided an option for quiet study and revision in the run-up to and during the examination period;
- The SHL had already agreed to dispense with its collection of PhD theses and to return these to their originating institutions – so this could be said to be evidence of one area where the level of service provided by the SHL had been reduced.

RESOLVED:

- 5.4 That LC members be asked to gather feedback from their faculty/department constituencies on whether or not i) the SHL was still regarded as providing a valuable service for their staff and students and ii) there had been any noticeable reduction in the level of service since the implementation of the refocusing option.

[ACTION: LC members]

6 REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF UCL LIBRARY SERVICES

[LC Min. 27, 2009-10]

Received:

- 6.1 A report at APPENDIX LC 1-02 (10-11).
- 6.2 An oral report from the Director of UCL Library Services.

Reported:

- 6.3 The report at APPENDIX LC 1-02 (10-11), as well as all future reports from the Director of UCL Library Services, would aim to focus on high-level strategic issues on which LC members' views were sought.

Managing space at the Wickford store

- 6.4 The area designated for books at UCL Library Services' remote store at Belnor House, Wickford had only eight years' worth of space left for monographs and only two to three years' of space left for journals. This was not a sustainable solution, and it was clear that, at current rates of activity, the store would fill up within the next few years.
- 6.5 Although UCL's membership of the UK Research Reserve would help to continue to release space in the journals section of the store, no work had yet been done in terms of releasing space for the book material. The Library would therefore need to begin to consider a policy for the long-term retention of monographs.
- 6.6 LC was invited to consider the following strategic questions:
1. What criteria could be used to identify monographs to be relegated from Store?

2. UCL Library Services had collections of national importance in some areas. Should UCL continue to acquire material in these areas, with all the pressures on space that such a policy would bring? Or should these collections also be subject to criteria for relegation?

Accommodation and provision for UCL Special Collections

- 6.7 The lease on 140 Hampstead Road, where the UCL Special Collections were currently housed, would expire in September 2011, and UCL Estates and Facilities had advised that it would not be renewed as the Landlord had planning permission to re-develop the site. A temporary home, in London but outside the Bloomsbury campus, was being sought for the Collections for two years from 2011 to September 2013, and discussions had begun with UCL Art Collections and with the UCL Records Office to collocate their collections and services with UCL Special Collections in a refurbished space in central London from September 2013.
- 6.8 LC was invited to consider the following strategic questions:
 1. UCL Special Collections had a respectable list of collaborations and interactions with academic Departments over the use of rare materials to support teaching and learning. But much more could and should be done. In what ways could UCL Special Collections develop to support teaching and learning across the whole of UCL?
 2. Traditionally, UCL Special Collections had offered support for researchers – both inside and outside UCL. What new facilities should/could UCL Special Collections offer to support research once they were in new premises from 2013.
 3. Engagement with the general public outside UCL was a new agenda for UCL Special Collections, but one that would form one of the Key Performance Areas of the Library's new strategy. What should UCL Special Collections do to develop work in this area?

UCL Library Services Strategy

- 6.9 The UCL Library Services Strategy was currently being revised² and an expanded Planning Team had been established to take this work forward. Roadshows had also been made available to academic Departments to comment on work to date.
- 6.10 Four key performance areas had been identified for the new Strategy, which would be supported by SMART objectives and Key Performance Indicators to measure performance against the targets. The four key performance areas were: The Student Experience, Research Support, Public Engagement, Healthcare Practice.
- 6.11 LC was invited to consider the following strategic questions:
 1. What were colleagues' reactions to the suggestions for taking forward the 4 Key Performance Areas?

² The current version was available online at <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/Library/libstrat.shtml>.

2. What key objectives did colleagues wish the Library to accomplish in the next Strategy period?

Discussion:

6.12 The following points were raised during discussion:

- The UCL Museums and Collections had very clear disposal policies in place which were required to be approved by both MHCP and UCL Council. UCL did not currently have a disposal policy in place for its book collection. This needed to be addressed or otherwise it would risk the future acquisition of book materials by UCL;
- The Library Services collections of national importance had been acquired through purchases and donations and were in the areas such as Neurology, Ophthalmology, Paediatrics, Archaeology, Slavonic and East European and Scandinavian Studies. In total, they constituted a significant proportion of the Library's total collection.
- It would be desirable to have a strategy in place for the collocation of the UCL Art Collections and the UCL Special Collections, particularly since the sharing space could have benefits for teaching engagement, etc. The Ink Exhibition currently running at UCL would offer good examples of what was possible in terms of this;
- The providers of the space where the UCL Special Collections would be temporarily housed from 2011-13 had confirmed that suitable arrangements would be implemented for looking after these collections. There would also be a weekly van service that would be able to bring requested items to and from the temporary location.
- Of the four key performance areas that had been identified for the new Library Services strategy, the two key drivers would be The Student Experience and Research Support;
- The availability of core texts and print facilities were the two recurring areas that the student body had identified as priorities in their meetings with the UCL Union Sabbatical Officers – in addition to 24-hour library access. However, the Chair of LC reiterated that if this was the case, it would be helpful for the UCL Union to give a formal indication of this through submission of a ranked list of their priorities for Library provision. It was also noted that there was already a mechanism in place within the Library for ensuring that further copies of core texts were purchased for items heavily in use, and that students needed to be made aware of this policy so that they were not dissuaded from taking core texts out when there was only a single copy remaining.

RESOLVED:

- 6.13 That LC members be asked to take the strategic questions set out at Minutes 6.6, 6.8 and 6.11 above back for discussion within their faculty/department constituencies, with a view to informing the Chair of LC and the Director of UCL Library Services of the consensus of views of their faculty and departmental colleagues by January 2011 at the latest.

[ACTION: LC members]

7 ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ANNUAL 'OPEN TOWN MEETING'

Noted:

- 7.1 One of the proposed arrangements for facilitating greater functionality, transparency and communication concerning Library matters within UCL (see Minute 1.7 above) was to hold an annual 'open town meeting' about Library issues.

Received:

- 7.2 An oral report from the Chair of LC.

Reported:

- 7.3 The Chair of LC drew attention to the following in his oral report:
- It was hoped that the annual 'open town meeting', which it was proposed should substitute for the Spring Term meeting of LC, would help to ensure that there was more of a focus on high-level strategic issues and provide an opportunity for the UCL community at large to further inform the formulation of Library policy. It was also hoped that this arrangement would facilitate the cascading of information relating to UCL Library Services news and developments to colleagues at departmental and faculty level;
 - It was envisaged that the format of the 'open town meeting' meeting would include a series of two or three brief presentations by Library Service colleagues on key topics or themes affecting Library Services and provision to Library users, followed by discussion and debate, with a view to this helping to inform Library policy and strategy, and a report by the Director of UCL Library Services on up-and-coming Library developments and events. Suggestions of possible topics for the first meeting included: Future Planning for Electronic Publishing and Delivery, the place of the Library in the ongoing UCL Masterplanning exercise and funding issues in the context of Library Services' contribution to priority areas identified by the student body and UCL's teaching and research agendas;
 - LC members were invited to suggest other possible topics to the Chair of LC and the Director of UCL Library Services. An email would be circulated in due course detailing arrangements for the first 'open town meeting' which would take place during the Spring Term 2011.

8 UCL LIBRARY SERVICES PROJECTS

Received:

- 8.1 A report on currently funded projects, in addition to projects for which Library Services is presently seeking funding, at APPENDIX LC 1-03 (10-11).

Reported:

- 8.2 The Director of UCL Library Services drew LC's attention to the following in particular:
- The total amount of project funding raised by UCL Library Services to date for 2010-11 (£40K) was considerably less than the previous year's figure, again reflecting how difficult it was in the current economic climate to secure funding from external sources;
 - UCL was to receive just under £200K from the EU Europeana Libraries project, matched by a contribution of £453K from its own resources (staff time as a contribution in kind). This was one example of how Library Services was resorting to bidding more for EU funding in collaboration with other European libraries, given the current squeeze on UK funding.

9 FACULTY LIBRARY COMMITTEES

Noted:

- 9.1 Since the last meeting of LC, the LC officers had received the Minutes of the following FLC meetings:
- Arts & Humanities and Social & Historical Sciences (Joint FLC) – 27 May 2010
 - Built Environment – 10 May 2010
 - Laws – 10 November 2010
 - Mathematical and Physical Sciences - 2 June 2010

10 DATES OF MEETINGS 2010-11

Noted:

- 10.1 Further dates of meetings for the 2010-11 session had been scheduled as follows:

Thursday 3 February 2011, 2pm-4pm - Ground Floor Meeting Room, 2 Taviton Street
[although in light of Minute 7 above, this meeting would not now take place]

Thursday 26 May 2011, 2pm-4pm - Ground Floor Meeting Room, 2 Taviton Street

GARY HAWES
Senior Academic Support Officer
Academic Services
[telephone 020 7679 8592, extension 28592, email: g.hawes@ucl.ac.uk]
11 February 2011