There will be a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday 6th June, 10.30am, Room 1.11, first floor, Main Library. Papers not included will be sent out by electronic mail and tabled.  

*Please note change of date and time.*

Sheila E Cannell  
Director of Library Services

**AGENDA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAPER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Welcome and apologies for absence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAPER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Convenor and Director of Library Services business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAPER</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Collections Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PAPER | 4 | Materials Budget, 2012-13  
*Paper to follow* |
| PAPER | 5 | Collections Policy  
*John Scally will make a presentation* |
| PAPER | 6 | Open Access Paper |
| PAPER | 7 | Main Library Redevelopment Review |
| PAPER | 8 | Library Services for Online Distance Learners |

**Reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAPER</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Update on Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PAPER | 10 | Building and Opening Hours Reports  
a) Main Library Redevelopment Project Update May 2012  
g) Library and Study Space Developments at KB in Summer 2012: overview  
*Verbal update will be given by Richard Battersby* |
| PAPER | 11 | College Library Committee  
a) College of SE – [http://www.library.scieng.ec.ac.uk](http://www.library.scieng.ec.ac.uk)  
b) College of MVM – [http://www.lc.mvm.ed.ac.uk](http://www.lc.mvm.ed.ac.uk)  
c) College of HSS – [http://www.clc.hss.ed.ac.uk](http://www.clc.hss.ed.ac.uk) |
| PAPER | 12 | EUSA Report |

**Minutes and matters arising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAPER</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Minutes of the meeting held on 11th April 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAPER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Matters arising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPER</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Any other business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPER</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dates of meetings 2012-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Agendum 3

Collections Review

Brief description of the paper
The paper is the Recommendations from the recent Collections Review, chaired by Vice-Principal Nigel Brown. The appendices to the Review are available at [http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/about/strategy-planning/strategies](http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/about/strategy-planning/strategies) A verbal update will be given on the progress of the recommendations.

Action requested
Library Committee is invited to review and comment on the implications of the recommendations.

Resource implications
The Collections review identified a shortfall in funding in the library materials budget of £1 million. £0.5m has been identified through the 2012-13 planning round. Discussions with Colleges are underway to discuss the residual funding.

Risk Assessment
There is no formal risk assessment in the paper.

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications?
No

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business?
Yes

Originator of the paper
Sheila Cannell, on behalf of the Collections Review
COLLECTIONS REVIEW REPORT

Introduction

There are a number of contextual issues which affect library collection development and the library materials budget:

- Concern with the quality of the collections as reflected in recent student and postgraduate experience surveys.
- Concern with inflationary trends in the library materials budget which leads to annual issues through the planning round.
- The desire by the University to achieve the best usage, now and in the future, for the collections, in order to show value for money.
- The rapidly accelerating shift to the digital in library collections, now very rapid, impacting on books as well as journals.
- The diversity of need for library collections in the University community, across disciplines and for interdisciplinary areas, for undergraduates, taught and research postgraduates and staff, for on and off campus users, and for digital, print and other formats of materials.
- New ways of acquiring collections, eg bundling or disbundling, patron-driven acquisition, pay-per-use, inter-library loan.

Remit of review

Following on from the recent review of library expenditure by the Knowledge Strategy Committee on behalf of Court, Senior Vice-Principal Nigel Brown led a review of library collection development and the library materials budget arrangements. The review examined the inter-related issues of how the University of Edinburgh funds the library materials budget, how it acquires library collections, how they are used, and whether the collection leads to satisfaction and value for money. The review bore in mind the diverse nature of the University with regard to need for and use of literature.

The remit of the review is to:

- Establish the appropriate level of funding for the library collections (materials) budget for a University such as Edinburgh, bearing in mind the position of comparator Universities
- Consider usage data and satisfaction levels
- Ensure that the library collections address the diverse nature of the need across the University
- Consider the sources of funding which could be available to support the library collections, including central, College, School and research funding
- Examine methods of distribution of the library collections budget to ensure that these satisfy needs across the University community
- Examine established and newer methods of acquisition to consider which methods will provide the best collection for the University in terms of both usage and satisfaction
- Consider the risks to the University in current or proposed arrangements
- Address arrangements for any exceptional requirements
- Position the library collections and funding arrangements for future changes
- Make recommendations to Information Services and Colleges on a strategy for library collections

The Review will report to the Knowledge Strategy Committee. The membership of the Review Group is included in Appendix A. The Review Group met on 3 occasions in December 2011 and January and February 2012. Minutes of the meetings are in Appendix B.
Evidence gathering

The Group gathered evidence in the following areas. The evidence is attached to this report as appendices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>EVIDENCE</th>
<th>APPENDIX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocations</td>
<td>Background Information, section A</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input from Colleges</td>
<td>Appendix D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>Background information, section B</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative expenditure</td>
<td>Background information, section C</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional comparator statistics</td>
<td>Appendix E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of acquiring library materials</td>
<td>IS Services costs</td>
<td>Appendix F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current methods of procurement</td>
<td>Background information, sections D-E</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bundles use by Schools</td>
<td>Appendix G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New methods of procurement</td>
<td>Background information, section F</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User-led acquisition of books at Newcastle University Library</td>
<td>Appendix L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of collections</td>
<td>Background information, section G</td>
<td>Appendix C and Appendix K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with collection</td>
<td>Background information, section H</td>
<td>Appendix C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extract from LibQual report</td>
<td>Appendix H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting new needs</td>
<td>Report from EUSA</td>
<td>Appendix I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Access</td>
<td>Gold Open Access fees at the University of Edinburgh: working out a yearly cost</td>
<td>Appendix J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principles

The Review Group examined the evidence, and reached a shared understanding on a number of overarching principles on the library collections within which the recommendations of the Group should be viewed. These are:

- The University of Edinburgh is ambitious and aspirational.
- The availability of good library resources addresses the University’s strategy of excellence in research, excellence in teaching and knowledge exchange.
- Library resources are a key element of the student and staff experience.
- There are a number of challenges for library resources to meet the University’s ambitions and aspirations, particularly:
  - The appointment of the Chancellor’s Fellowships;
  - The increasing importance of masters or taught postgraduate degrees;
  - Increasing numbers of students and researchers;
  - The broad disciplinary nature of the University;
  - New methods of course delivery.
The use of e-resources is continuing to accelerate.

Print materials remain very important in some subject areas.

There is a background in which scholarly communications is changing rapidly.

There is evidence in surveys that the quality of the collection is declining, which is leading to dissatisfaction and unfulfilled demand. Students and researchers are identifying gaps in the collections.

New methods of procurement are available, which should be explored.

The Review Group was mindful of funding issues and recognised that some of the recommendations would require additional funding.

Devolved budgets are already tightly managed, leaving little room for additional purchasing through reappportioning existing resource.

**Recommendations from the Collections Review Group to the University**

1. The Group considers that the expenditure by the University of Edinburgh on library collections (“the library materials budget”) is not sufficient to meet the present ambition and aspirations of the University. This means that the quality of the collection is causing concern which is reflected in recent user surveys. The library collection needs to respond to the strategic direction of the University, for example to support the broad disciplinary nature of the University, the increased number of students and researchers, and new methods of course delivery.

The Group also considered that the present budget is insufficient in comparison to its peers. The evidence shows the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Average of Leeds, Manchester and UCL</th>
<th>Average of Russell Group libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials expenditure</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as percentage of institutional expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional requirement (at 2009-10 values) for Edinburgh to spend at same level as comparators</td>
<td>£1,043,520</td>
<td>£982,136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: calculations based on 2009-10 figures; calculations are based on the full collections budget, from whatever source, i.e. include IS, College and School allocations. Any new funding will require some additional staff resource, as a first call on the funding.

*The Group recommends that the University allocate additional funding of about £1 million for the library materials budget.*
2. The Group noted that the current resource is allocated by the University to Information Services (IS). This is then allocated to Colleges, with the advice of Library Committee, and in consultation with Colleges. The College allocation is then distributed to Schools. The Group does not recommend changing the method of allocation to Colleges, which uses the Income and Expenditure Attribution Model, for existing funds; but recommends using any additional funding in new ways. New funding is required for a variety of purposes: to supplement existing budgets which are under pressure, ensuring that these are addressed to support areas of need, to support new methods of procurement outlined in Recommendation 5 and 6, and for staffing to support new work.

The Group recommends no change to the current resource allocation methods for current funding using the Income and Expenditure Attribution Model for allocation to Colleges and that additional funding should be allocated by Information Services, with advice from Library Committee and in consultation with Colleges, to supplement existing budgets, to support new requirements in Recommendation 5 and 6 and for staffing to support the new work. Timely communication between Schools, Colleges and Information Services is important in determining the prioritisation of activities for funding.

3. The Group noted the need to support a wide range of needs in the University. These include both existing and new areas of research, as represented by the Chancellor’s Fellowships, and new method of learning and teaching, as represented by online distance learning. The Group also noted the need to provide equity and to support diversity, and to protect the needs of specialised disciplines.

The Group recommends that it is essential that new demands in the University are supported and that subject areas with broad application, and small specialised subject areas must be supported equitably.

4. The Group agreed that the University needs to establish long-term mechanisms to address issues to do with the uplift required in library materials expenditure due to publisher inflation, currency fluctuations and changes in the VAT regime. The University should accommodate the known uplifts due to publisher inflation in the annual planning round to avoid these being additional calls on the IS or College budgets. Currency shifts are more difficult to predict and will need to be dealt with on an ad hoc basis in planning rounds and in consultation with the Finance Office. Currently, VAT only impacts e-resources.

The Group recommends that the annual planning and budgeting process in the University acknowledges the uplift required in library materials expenditure due to publisher inflation, currency fluctuations and the VAT regime in order to maintain steady state in purchasing power.

5. The Group noted with interest new methods of acquiring library materials which give users more direct control, and considered that a proportion of any new sources of library materials funding should be used in innovative ways, including:

   a. User driven acquisition for e-books and monographs
   b. Direct student requests for textbooks in high demand with a commitment to fast availability.
   c. Elimination of the charges incurred by users for inter-library loans with appropriate safeguards against overuse.
These should be monitored and reported on with particular attention being paid to how these methods of acquisition impact on user satisfaction.

The Group recommends using a proportion of any new funding for pilots in new methods of procurement.

6. The Group noted the difficulties around supporting the library needs of new and changing programmes and new or declining areas of research, and noted the importance of clear lines of communication between the Schools to the Library.

The Group considered that the University, through a proportion of any new sources of library materials funding, should provide strategic one-off support for new initiatives in research and teaching. Boards of Studies must have and enforce a light touch approval process for new programmes at all levels, both on campus and online distance to ensure that the Library has the appropriate library resources or that mechanisms have been put in place to provide them in good time before the commencement of the programme. Importantly, the Library also needs to know about significant changes in numbers of students on existing programmes and courses, but noted that these should normally be covered in the normal annual review of courses.

The Group also noted the difficulties in supporting new areas of research, often in interdisciplinary areas, particularly with regard to requests for new journals. The Group recognised the needs of incoming staff, eg Chancellor’s Fellows, who, if they are working in a subject area not previously supported, will have immediate demands for new collections.

The Group recommends that the Library, through a proportion of any new funding, establishes a “strategic fund” to provide support for library resources for new programmes where library collections are weak prior to the commencement of the programme and to provide immediate support to incoming researchers working in new areas of research. The “strategic fund” would be managed through a regular bidding process, managed by Library Committee.

7. The Group recognised the importance for clear signposting of the availability of all resources through a one-stop shop approach, and the importance of strong resource discovery mechanisms. The Group noted the Resource Discovery Board and considered that this should be re-established to continue its work to monitor and seek ways to enhance usage to ensure that the investment in library materials shows good value for money.

The Group recommends the re-establishment of the Resource Discovery Board to continue its work in improving the resource discovery layer.

8. The Group agreed that it is important that there should be regular and rigorous assessments to ensure that the library materials budget is continuing to provide value for money. This can be achieved through the creation and dissemination of regular reports on metrics on usage, with light touch reviews by Colleges.

The Group was concerned to hear of some inefficiencies in the financial management of the library collections budget, which had been identified in the recent lean review of the Acquisitions and Metadata processes. Changes in this area would reduce the overhead costs, while not changing the resource allocation model. However it is necessary to ensure that this is carefully reviewed, as part of the annual monitoring of cost per usage, to prevent stasis in the collection.
The Group recommends that an annual report on metrics of usage is produced, and appropriate changes are made in consultation with the academic community through College Library Committees.

The Group recommends that, from August 2012 that, after the initial resource allocation by the Income and Expenditure Attribution Model, that the funding for and the management of higher value bundles which are of interest in 2 or more Colleges or in 3 or more Schools are moved to a central library account code. There should be a triennial academic review of these bundles.

9. The Group noted that there is strong professional collaboration, and links to other organisations in the procurement of library resources, which is to the benefit of both the University of Edinburgh and other universities. There are also reciprocal access arrangements which give users access to the resources of other libraries, including the National Library of Scotland.

The Group recommends that the Library continues and increases its leadership role in collaborative activity in procurement of library materials, where these are in the interests of the University of Edinburgh.

The Group recommends closer links be made to the National Library of Scotland, and that the University support reciprocal access arrangements with other libraries.

10. The Group acknowledges the importance of Open Access publishing, which may lead to a different method for scholarly communication over time. This is of particular interest to Research Councils and major charities. At the moment, it is difficult to know how much is spent on Open Access fees in the University, and the Group suggests that this is coordinated. This will lead to greater understanding of the expenditure on Open Access fees. With this understanding it will be possible to challenge publishers when they are charging for the same content through Open Access fees and subscription fees.

The Group recommends that the Finance Office establish an Open Access job code for the payment of all Open Access fees from August 2012.

The Group recommends that the Library works with publishers to understand the multiple routes by which publishers may be paid for the same item, and seeks to reduce this through renegotiation.

The Group recommends pursuing discussions with Research Councils and major charities on library materials and open access fees.
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Agendum 4

Library Materials Budget 2012-2013

Brief description of the paper
This paper gives information about the recurrent element of the Library Materials Budget for 2012-2013.

Action requested
For information and discussion

Resource implications
The paper is about the allocation and use of resources.

Risk Assessment
There is no formal risk assessment in the paper.

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper
Sheila Cannell
Director of Library and Collections
June 2012 (revised 7.6.2012)
Edinburgh University Library Committee

Library Materials Budget 2012-13

Materials budget baseline 2011-2012

The baseline for the allocation of the library materials budget for 2012-13 is the recurrent budget which was allocated in 2011-12. The initial allocations were supplemented with the second allocation made in March, and with merger related allocations. The merger related allocations only include Edinburgh College of Art (ECA), but not the Human Genetics Unit (HGU)—this is because ECA is now included in the Income and Expenditure Allocation Model but HGU is not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011-12 Initial allocation</th>
<th>2011-12 Second allocation</th>
<th>2011-12 Merger related allocations</th>
<th>2011-12 Total allocation (baseline for 2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHSS</td>
<td>£1,472,788</td>
<td>£87,441</td>
<td>£155,572</td>
<td>£1,715,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMVM</td>
<td>£914,267</td>
<td>£64,295</td>
<td></td>
<td>£978,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS&amp;E</td>
<td>£1,170,404</td>
<td>£82,551</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,252,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total College</td>
<td>£3,557,459</td>
<td>£234,287</td>
<td>£155,572</td>
<td>£3,947,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>£454,109</td>
<td>£30,713</td>
<td>£48,282</td>
<td>£533,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£4,011,568</td>
<td>£265,000</td>
<td>£203,854</td>
<td>£4,480,422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculations for 2012-13 allocation

From this baseline, the following calculations have been made on uplift and the Library Resource Allocation Model:

Uplift

The standard uplift being applied to Information Services costs is 3%, based on the uplift of 3% for core Information Services activity. This has been applied in the table below to the Total College and Interdisciplinary Funds. The uplift gives the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Plus 3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College funds</td>
<td>£3,947,318</td>
<td>£4,065,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>£533,104</td>
<td>£549,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£4,480,422</td>
<td>£4,614,835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library Resource Allocation Model

The total College funding, uplifted by 3%, has been allocated according to the Library Resource Allocation Model, based on the Income and Expenditure Attribution Model, giving new allocations for the Colleges for this year. The
IEAM which has been used is the most recent available, i.e. 2011/12, version 2.1, with Business School toggle set to 1 for inclusion.

The IEAM figures applied this year, in comparison to last year are in the following table. The figure for CHSS now includes ECA but HGU is not yet included in the IEAM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>For:2012-13 IEAM 2011/12 v2.1</th>
<th>For 2011-12 IEAM 2010/11 v 2.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHSS</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMVM</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS&amp;E</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocating the IEAM to the baseline figures for the Colleges gives these allocations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IEAM</th>
<th>Allocation 2012-13</th>
<th>Allocation 2011-12</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percentage change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHSS</td>
<td>44.50%</td>
<td>£1,809,253</td>
<td>£1,715,801</td>
<td>£93,452</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMVM</td>
<td>24.70%</td>
<td>£1,004,237</td>
<td>£978,562</td>
<td>£25,675</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS&amp;E</td>
<td>30.80%</td>
<td>£1,252,247</td>
<td>£1,252,955</td>
<td>-£707.84</td>
<td>-0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total College</td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,065,737</td>
<td>£3,947,318</td>
<td>£118,419</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td>£549,097</td>
<td>£533,104</td>
<td>£15,993</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>£4,614,835</td>
<td>£3,380,422</td>
<td>£134,413</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further steps before final allocation to Colleges

1. In accordance with the recommendation in the Collections Review bundles which are of interest in 2 or more Colleges or in 3 or more Schools will be moved to a central library account code. This will be done shortly prior to final allocations to the colleges.

2. The Human Genetics fund of £40,000, will be transferred to the Interdisciplinary Fund, where it was used last year to support the purchase of SCOPUS.

Library materials costs, 2012-13
As usual, we cannot be certain about the costs of library materials in 2013-13, but there is more certainty than in 2011-12. In 2011-12, we had the uncertainty created by major renegotiations, currency fluctuations and the increased level of VAT. At the moment, while some of the major publishers have led to a fixed price in sterling for the coming year, other renegotiations are due, with some publishers making noises of expecting uplift of up to 20% (potentially 100% over 5 years). We therefore advise that the uplift which should be used in making calculations for Colleges is 5% for journals, ejournals, books and ebooks.
Other sources of funding
There are other sources of funding available. These are:

1. School funds. Several Schools make supplementary funds available.
2. Other funds are made available on a regular basis, for example NHS funding to MVM. These can be subject to fluctuations in value.
3. Finally, there are Endowment funds available in a number of discrete subject areas for purchase of materials. These can either be used for additional expenditure or to offset planned expenditure. It is appropriate to ensure that these funds are spent—although there are differing restrictions applicable to the expenditure of each fund.

Additional sums due to Collections Review
The Collections Review identified a shortfall of £1 million in the library materials budget. £500,000 has been allocated to the Library materials budget as a result of the Collections Review. Information Services is still in negotiation with the Colleges with regard to making up the additional £500k.

Sheila Cannell
June 2012
Revised 7.6.2012
The University of Edinburgh

Library Committee
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Agendum 6

Open Access: the way ahead

Brief description of the paper
The paper outlines developments in scholarly communication, the current position of the University of Edinburgh with regard to Open Access, and a set of suggested actions for the University to undertake to promote Open Access, in order to be able to comply with funder mandates.

Action requested
Library Committee is asked to discuss the paper, and suggest amendments, prior to submitting it to the Research Policy Group.

Resource implications
A change in scholarly communication will, over time, transfer the costs of making research outputs available. In the interim period, there will be transitional funding requirements based on the need to maintain existing patterns of expenditure, as well as moving to new patterns.

Risk Assessment
There is no formal risk assessment in the paper, but there are risks associated with managing this change, and with not complying with funder mandates.

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper
Sheila Cannell, Director of Library Services
June 2012
Open Access: the way ahead

Introduction

The environment within which researchers publish research outputs has seen many changes since the advent of the Internet. More changes are on their way, with a forthcoming UK Government report likely to mandate the toll-free public availability of all publicly funded research. Change is likely to be monumental but incremental. This paper lays out a possible roadmap for the University of Edinburgh towards a full Open Access model for its research outputs, based on fuller adoption of the “Gold” Open Access route, which changes the economic model for publishing, but otherwise retains many of its features. There will, however, be transition costs to reach this new model. The University is already well positioned, and can take a leading role in these changes in Scotland and the UK. Library Committee and Research Policy Group are asked to support and take ownership of these developments.

Developments in scholarly communications

Scholarly communications has developed over many years, to reach the rather uneasy model we have now. In the current environment, researchers tend to give away copyright to the publishers, the research community provides the free peer review which is an essential part of the process, university libraries buy back the content in the form of subscriptions, and publishers make profits. The University of Edinburgh spends £1.7million per annum with just 3 major publishers.

Since the development of the Internet, there have been significant changes in research working styles, and in the ways in which research is disseminated informally, but the formal routes of research dissemination via the publishers have changed little. Some subject areas, eg physics, have seen much greater change than others, with the development of subject based open repositories of research. But, in the meantime, scholarly publishing remains the only profitable part of publishing with Universities paying ever more to buy back their content—the Economist has called it “a license to print money”. Publishers have pushed the publisher “bundle” of all their content—which has radically increased the content available—but means that we buy journals which are used, and journals which are not used.

Open Access publishing initiatives have provided a way of making research dissemination more open in the Internet environment. By and large, researchers are quite happy that their research is more openly available, with caveats in particular circumstances, for example where the research funder does not wish the research to be publicly available, or where there are data protection issues. But researchers have found the processes for making research Open Access unclear, clunky and time-consuming, so there has been less adoption than Open Access advocates might have hoped for.

---

1 In the case of Elsevier, the profit is 37.3% (£768 million) in 2011 (http://reporting.reedelsevier.com/ar11/financial-statements/interactive-charting-tool/)
The situation is now perhaps becoming clearer, with Gold Open Access, in which the majority of research publishing is through traditional journals, and retains peer review, becoming the dominant model. This model will, over time, lead to a complete change in the way in which research publishing is paid for, so that the researcher—or the research funder, or University—pays at the point of publication, and the content immediately becomes freely available to all. Many existing subscription based journals have adopted a hybrid business model where the author pays to provide Open Access to individual articles, whilst the remainder of the journal content remains locked behind subscription access. The mixed economy is criticised as an opportunity for publishers to “double dip” costs and maximise profits through getting paid both for the subscription and the Open Access fee. However, as responsible publishers are beginning to reduce their subscription costs to reflect the contribution of Gold Open Access fees, this process can be seen as the start of the mainstream publishing transition to Open Access. It is also worth noting that there is a movement to commence Open Access monograph publishing.

Research Councils and the Wellcome Trust now have mandates in place that their research must be publicly available, and these mandates are gradually changing researcher behaviour. The forthcoming UK Government Finch report, due to be published in mid-June, is likely to mandate that all publicly funded research should be Open Access, with a strong preference on Gold OA. It is probable that the Research Excellence Framework after the present one will prefer Open Access publications. Recent announcements from some US universities including Harvard University have signalled a strong move towards Open Access. Harvard signals this transition in the memo, saying: “Many large journal publishers have made the scholarly communication environment fiscally unsustainable and academically restrictive”.

Any change will need to address—across the sector as a whole—the cultural issues around this major change in scholarly communications. There remains a great desire to publish in well respected high impact journals, because this is the way to progress a research career. As part of this process, the reward structures will need to be reviewed. Part of this may be around any changes for the next REF; but also a clearer understanding about the particular position of publishing in high impact journals. At the moment, Open Access journals may be perceived to have lower impact, but recent moves by the Wellcome and others to establish high impact, peer-reviewed Open Access journals may change this.

**Funding the change**

The Finch report is also like to make recommendations about how the Gold Author fees should be managed. There is likely to be an acknowledgement that, since more research happens in research intensive universities, there will be an incremental transfer of costs to these universities. Universities will need to work together to ensure that fees are managed, that is both negotiated to a minimal level, and, possibly, negotiated at a national level, for example by JISC. What is clear is that, over time, these fees would effect a transfer of costs to research budgets.

---

3 [http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k77982&tabgroupid=icb.tabgroup143448](http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k77982&tabgroupid=icb.tabgroup143448)

4 [http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Spotlight-issues/Open-access/Journal/index.htm](http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/About-us/Policy/Spotlight-issues/Open-access/Journal/index.htm)
I should make it clear that there will be transition costs in order to make this change. At the moment, the UK is showing a national leadership role in this area, which could mean that all UK research (c 6% of the world’s research) would be publicly available in Open Access, but the rest of the world’s research would not. This would mean that the UK would have to pay for the 2 systems, while other countries catch up in order to provide access to research from the rest of the world.

**University of Edinburgh current position**

The University of Edinburgh is well positioned to respond to these coming changes. The following are in place already:

- The University Strategic Plan, and the forthcoming Strategic Plan 2012-16 promote the concept of dissemination and openness.
- The University has had a Research Publications Policy promoting Open Access research since 2009.
- There is digital architecture in place to support this. It has taken some time to get the architecture right, and it is probable that this has been difficult for researchers to understand, but the current combination of PURE and Edinburgh Research Explorer provides suitable platforms to make Edinburgh’s research visible to all.
- There is an agreed copyright template for researchers to use to retain certain rights for professional activities when submitting journal articles for publication.
- We have recently established a post to promote Open Scholarship, creating a central resource to work with advocates of Open Access in Schools.
- An account code for Open Access fees has recently been established which can be used to track costs of Gold Open Access fees paid to publishers in the University (both for central and research funds).
- We have an Open Journal hosting service, which supports open publication within the University in some circumstances.
- We have received JISC funding, in both the Library and Edina, in Open Access, and are acknowledged leaders in the field. For example, we have recently received funding to establish an Open Access Index.
- We are involved with a projects on Open Access monograph publishing in association with other European libraries.

But current Open Access figures for UoE are low. For research produced in 2010 we estimate a figure of 17% Open Access for the University of Edinburgh (~778 articles). From a total of 4600 published articles, assuming no overlap between the sources, we know that 685 full text articles were deposited in UKPMC, and 93 article records have been self-archived in ERA and PURE (Green Open Access).

The Gold Open Access costs for 2010 are estimated to be in the region of £544,000. We have identified a minimum of 272 papers which have attracted some form of article processing fee which normally averages around £2000 per article.

---

[^5]: http://www.research.ed.ac.uk/portal/
[^6]: http://journals.ed.ac.uk/
Next steps for University of Edinburgh

For the University to take this to the next stage, and in order to comply with forthcoming mandates, it is necessary to agree a new roadmap which expects all research outputs in the University to be Open Access, unless there are strong reasons why they should not be.

The programme suggested below essentially provides a transition path from the current model to a new model. There will be transitional costs during the change. During the transition, it will be necessary to maintain expenditure on the current publishing model by purchasing the journals from publishers. Initially, the Open Access fees will need to be covered by research funds. However, as we establish the costs of these fees, we can begin to claim sums back from the publishers, with the aim of transferring much of the cost from the library materials budget to purchase subscriptions, to the authors in order to pay Open Access fees. This will be an incremental process, but it is important to start it now.

The following list provides a list of actions which the University of Edinburgh can undertake:

- Revision of Research Publications Policy\(^7\) to take account of the revised environment.
- Agreement about simple messages which are clear for researchers, and which should be promulgated by Research Policy Group, research administrators and others. These messages should include:
  1. The University of Edinburgh mandates Open Access for all research unless there are good reasons why it should not be Open Access.
  2. The University of Edinburgh accepts that there are a variety of places in which Open Access content can appear, eg Edinburgh Research Explorer, Open Access subject repositories, Open Access journals, Gold Open Access in traditional journals through an author fee.
  3. The University of Edinburgh requires that all research outputs will be put into PURE, and that, at the same time advocates that the final manuscript version of the research output is put into Pure for automatic transmission to the Edinburgh Research Explorer. If the research output already appears in another Open Access source, the URL or DOI should be provided.
  4. The University of Edinburgh will operate a takedown policy from Edinburgh Research Explorer if there should be any issues with publishers\(^8\).
  5. All Open Access or Author Pays fees should be paid from the newly established Finance Office account code to allow for financial monitoring of expenditure with publishers.
- Agreement of the circumstances in which it is acceptable for research not to be Open Access (eg research funder requirement, data protection reasons, embargo for up to one year to allow further publication)
- Addressing any issues and tensions which these changes will mean for reward structures.

\(^7\) [http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/about/policies-and-regulations/research-publications](http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/about/policies-and-regulations/research-publications)

\(^8\) Takedown policy already in operation is at: [http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/services/research-support/publish-research/research-publications/rps-policies/rps-policies-take-down](http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/services/research-support/publish-research/research-publications/rps-policies/rps-policies-take-down)
• Establishment of a programme of work with researchers to promulgate this message. This programme will involve research administrators, Edinburgh Research and Innovation, and staff in Information Services (subject librarians, open scholarship staff, RPS team). In addition to the messages above, this will need to ensure that researchers:
  o Understand the mandates in place
  o Understand the architecture of the various systems (glossary and architecture)
  o Know they do not need to pay, emphasising the cost of low or no cost Open Access publishing
  o Understand that the REF and Open Access are compatible
  o Understand that progression and reward structure are not impacted by Open Access publishing

• Examination of the possibility of using the Open Journal publishing initiative in the University to publish journals, for example “the Best of Edinburgh research in (subject)”

• Work to take control of the relationship with publishers, to include:
  o Publicising expenditure on journals
  o Negotiating with publishers for discounts to prevent double dipping, i.e. when publishers receive payment both through subscription and through author fees.
  o Publishing blacklist of publishers who have long embargo period

Sheila Cannell
Director of Library Services
June 2012
Brief description of the paper
The paper is in 2 parts: the first part looks at outstanding issues towards the end of the Main Library redevelopment, effectively forming an exit strategy for the Project. The second part is a more general retrospective of the project from 2003-2013, reviewing the project at a high level.

Action requested
Library Committee is asked to discuss the outstanding issues, which will continue to be important for the Library in the years to come.

Resource implications
The Main Library redevelopment is a major capital project for the University. The outstanding issues will require recurrent resource, to ensure that the benefits created by the Redevelopment are not dissipated.

Risk Assessment
There is no formal risk assessment in the paper.

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications?
No

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business?
Yes

Originator of the paper
Sheila Cannell
Director of Library Services
June 2012
MAIN LIBRARY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The redevelopment of the Main Library is nearing completion, with the final section, the Lower Ground Floor, now under construction. This paper gives an overview of the project to date. The paper starts with a review of the outstanding issues, which Library Committee should be aware of as we reach the end of the project. The second part of the paper provides a retrospective view of the project.

Outstanding issues: exit strategy at the end of the project

Collections

The physical collections of the Main Library have been extensively worked on during the redevelopment and are now in a much better state than they were at the commencement of the project in terms of arrangement, condition and findability. The challenge is to maintain this active collections management which has proved so successful inside the redevelopment project envelope. The general collections are now divided into the HUB Collections for undergraduate reading on the Ground Floor; the Library of Congress collections in one sequence on the 2nd and 3rd floors; and journals and a number of specialised sequences of books on the 4th floor. There is growth for current predicted acquisition for about 10 years in the general collections on the 2nd and 3rd floors, if we maintain our investment in collections management activities such as de-duplication and reviewing the HUB collection annually. The Special Collections are in purpose built, environmentally controlled archive stores on the 5th floor and Lower Ground Floor, but this space is nearing capacity because of the number of new collections which are being acquired at the moment.

Overall, we now have excellent information about the size and growth of the physical collections, and will continue to maintain this. The redevelopment has happened against a backdrop of change in publishing and use of books and journals, and we will expect to see continued change which will impact on the size of the physical collections. We are likely to be able to continue to dispose of journals which are available in digital format with trusted arrangements, but should expect to see an increase in holdings in areas where the physical object is important, particularly in Special Collections and in Humanities monographs.

The Collections Policy will continue to guide Library decisions in the expansion and contraction of the collections; and this may need to be reflected in future changes to the sections of the building devoted to collections.

Library Committee is asked to note the need to maintain a watching brief on the sizes of the collections, and how these may impact on the nature of the space in the building.
Library Annexe

The Library Annexe commenced life as a decant store for the Main Library redevelopment, with the first Annexe, which was smaller than had been hoped for, being leased and fitted out at the start of the project, and the second Annexe in 2010. However, the Library Annexes are now an essential part of the Library service, delivering 150 requests per day. The annual cost of the service is c £175,000, including the cost of the leases, staffing and service costs.

The availability of the Annexe has allowed for the creation of the variety of study space which is proving to be so popular, through the storage of less used materials offsite.

The Annexe is now used by other parts of the University, including all Colleges, and in particular the Schools of Divinity, ECA, Law, Veterinary Medicine, and is forming an essential part of the strategy to move the School of Literature, Languages and Culture to the redeveloped 50 George Square.

In 2013, the Main Library Project will cease to pay for the Annexe leases, staffing and service, and this will present a challenge to Information Services and the University.

*Library Committee is asked to comment on the importance of the Annexe, and to support the proposal that the University needs to continue to fund the Annexe as a core component of the IS Library service.*

Study space

The Main Library now provides very popular space, with usage having doubled since the start of the redevelopment. The original prediction—an increase of c.20%—has been massively overtaken.

The increasing usage is due to two inter-related factors: there is an underlying increase in usage of libraries by students, which is being seen by many universities—this may indeed represent about 20% over the 5 years of the redevelopment. On top of this, the Main Library has seen a step change in use when each floor is completed, which has led to the doubling of usage currently being seen.

In the recent exams in summer 2012, the Main Library has just about coped, with the recent addition of the 550 spaces on the 4th floor; but it is likely that more study space will be needed to meet continuing increased demand. This issue is being reviewed by the Study Spaces Group, reporting to the Learning and Teaching Spaces Advisory Group on to Library Committee and Estates Committee. There are a number of initiatives in place, including the construction of new study space (eg in King’s Building Library, David Hume Tower basement), better publicity about alternative study spaces, and ensuring that study and exam space co-exist. It is also likely that the opening hours will continue to be under review.

*Library Committee will wish to add its support to these initiatives. However, the Committee should note that students are likely to continue with their expectation of the Main Library as being the preferred place to work, because it provides the complex set of activities which surround and make for good study space, and that it may prove difficult to manage these expectations, other than through an extension to the Main Library.*
Other services in the Main Library

It seems probable that other services will wish to use the Main Library as a location, because it is now the place where so many students are present. The Student Services (Careers, Counselling and Disability) already present in the Main Library have seen increased usage of up to 40%, due to greater visibility. It is likely that Student Information Points will be installed over the coming summer.

*Library Committee will wish to support the inclusion of other services in the Main Library, but will also wish to consider what this may mean for the existing library services provided in the building.*

Issues created by volume of usage: cleaning and maintenance

The increased usage of the Main Library has led to a series of issues, including increased requirements for cleaning, general maintenance, and equipment replacement. With footfall predicted to top 2 million in 2011-12, this is presenting issues to both Estates and Buildings and Information Services. It is worth noting that Interserve, the construction contractors, have been on site for the 5 years, and have been very helpful in assisting with maintenance issues on earlier phases of the project. As they finish the project and leave the site, this will fall to Information Services and Estates and Buildings to manage.

*Library Committee is asked to support Facilities staff in seeking additional cleaning and maintenance for the Main Library to support the increased footfall.*

Continuing development

No building stands still, and it is likely that many changes, affecting both the collections and services, will happen over the next few years which, without strong management, will make the Main Library less logical and less attractive than it is now. This redevelopment of the Main Library has happened 40 years after the initial build--it is considered that the increased usage will lead to the next redevelopment in something between 20-30 years.
MAIN LIBRARY REDEVELOPMENT, 2003-2013

Introduction

The redevelopment of the Main Library has been a 10 year project, and as it reaches the end, it is timely to provide a retrospective of the project.

Planning commenced with feasibility studies in 2003, and, as I write in late spring 2012, the project is almost complete, with only the work on the Lower Ground Floor to be completed. The Design Team, led by Lewis & Hickey Architects, were appointed in 2005 and construction commenced in 2007. The 5th and 6th floors, the Centre for Research Collections, was completed in 2008, the Ground Floor in 2009, with the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors following along at about 9 month intervals.

The project vision, which was developed in consultation with staff and students, declared that the Main Library would be transformed for the twenty first century, and be:

- An intellectual hub for the University
- The focus of a wide range of activities in learning and research
- More open and accessible
- A place where users can engage and converse with each other and with information specialists
- Flexible to accommodate changes in the future.

The redevelopment has certainly been successful, and the Library is busier than ever, with many saying that the Main Library both reflects its past and works for the present and future. The redevelopment has been an opportunity to review the collections, the study space and the service provided in the building.

Collections

The redevelopment has provided an unparalleled opportunity to work intensively with the collections, and these are now in a better and more logical state. As originally envisaged in 1967, the collections are now more research-oriented as you move higher in the building, with the Ground Floor providing all the facilities which a first year student needs. The creation of the HUB (High Use Books), on the Ground Floor, has been very successful, now accounting for over half of all loans. As students progress through their University career, they progress up the building and learn more of what it has to offer.

All the books in the building have had to be moved at least twice—once out of the floor they were on, and once back. We estimate that during the whole project, we have moved c150 linear kilometres of books. But this has provided an opportunity to handle each book, and we have been able to reclassify more books to the Library of Congress sequences, and check the locations of books. The logical sequence of Library of Congress books on the 2nd and 3rd floors makes it easier for users to find the books they need. The aisles between the shelves are wider—this makes it possible for disabled users to navigate the shelves more easily.

All this has happened against a background of rapid change in the ways in which books and journals are used, as more and more becomes available in digital form.
For the duration of the project we have had to move some books to the specially created Library Annexes at South Gyle, but we have moved as many as we can back into the Main Library. The books which will remain in the Annexes are much less used, and usually available in digital form. The Annexes are supported by a fast delivery service.

We now have growth for 10 years in the general collections, although the Special Collections areas are fuller. The table below shows the linear meterage of the space for collections at the beginning and end of the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003-2004</th>
<th>End of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th floor</td>
<td>17124</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th floor</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>7,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th floor</td>
<td>15216</td>
<td>8,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd floor</td>
<td>13601</td>
<td>12,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd floor</td>
<td>3689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st floor</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground floor</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ground floor</td>
<td>9578</td>
<td>5775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Annexe</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>33000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63223</td>
<td>47040 plus Annexes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study space**

The redevelopment has seen a huge increase in the usage of the Main Library, particularly by students. Most of this increase in usage has been achieved by increasing the occupancy of desks, by ensuring that the desks are big enough. We have also increased the number of study spaces, from c 1750 to c.2200 (expandable to about 2300 during exam periods). The tables below show the increased usage of the Library. It seems probable that the footfall in 2011-12 will exceed 2 million, much increased from 1.1m in 2003-4, and 1.0m in 2007. The tables below show the average number of users and the gatecount figures from 2001 and 2003 and include a prediction for the figures for the current 2011-12 session.
The variety in the study space has also been increased, to suit student needs at different times. We are aware that many students will spend hours in the Library, and may move around the spaces to suit their needs at different times—from traditional study desks, to informal seating, to the group study pods to the Library Café. Many of the desks have pcs, and wireless and power is available throughout the building for students to use their own laptops. At exam and essay times, the traditional study desks are most popular. The group study pods have proved very popular, and support developments in teaching and learning methods in the University, and prepare students for working with others in the workplace.

We hear students say to each other that the Library “is the place to be”. I was a student at the University of Edinburgh just after the Main Library opened, and I spent much of my time in the Library—it is particularly gratifying to have been able to reinstate the Library as a place which students want to use!
Services

The redevelopment has also provided the opportunity to provide new services. Technology now makes it possible to provide more services in self-service mode, eg book loans and returns, allowing the staff at the Helpdesk to concentrate on the great variety of library, IT and e-learning enquiries which now come to them.

The Special Collections are now looked after in a manner more fitting the rare and special materials in the University of Edinburgh, in well-managed environmentally controlled archive stores on the 5th floor. The original Strong Room on the Lower Ground Floor, still to be completed, will provide a multifunctional storage area for many different types of collections. The Centre for Research Collections, with its reception on the 6th floor, provides a suite of services in purpose designed rooms—reading rooms, digital imaging, conservation, seminar rooms—located around the archive stores. The Treasures Room on the 5th floor provides a special environment for displaying the special collections to visitors and others. The Exhibition Room on the Ground Floor provides a wonderful environment for displaying the collections to a wider audience.

The Meeting Suite on the first floor has been popular—with the side benefit of ensuring that senior and other members of the University make regular visits to the Library, and see how well it is being used. While the inclusion of the Student Services—Careers, Counselling and Disability—in the redeveloped Library was initially controversial, this too has proved beneficial, because these service have seen vastly increased usage of services much needed by students.

Keeping going during the project

The project has been hard, but rewarding, work. All services have been maintained throughout the project, with no building closures, or formal complaints or appeals against exam results, as a result of the project. We have had temporary entrances, noise, dust and dirt, smells, temperature fluctuations. Communications have been key to keeping users on side. The phased nature of the project has meant that users have been able to see, from an early stage in the redevelopment, what could be achieved, and we have kept the support of the student body, and of the University, to complete the project, despite the difficult financial circumstances which started soon after the construction work commenced.

The Building

It is interesting to speculate whether Sir Basil Spence would have approved of the changes. Shortly before the redevelopment began, the building was A listed, which has presented a variety of challenges. The architects, Lewis & Hickey Architects, have succeeded in retaining the original look and feel, with many of the features, including some of the original 1960’s furniture, refurbished and still in remarkably good condition. The project has created a grander entrance, with the proud and confident LIBRARY sign outside. One aim of the project was to “bring the outside in”, by making George Square and the Meadows more important in the internal visual landscape, and this has definitely succeeded. The introduction of a subtle palate of colour into the original concrete and wood structure has been successful; as has the introduction of an elliptical shape into the rectilinear building.

The building is now in good shape to continue for many more years. Sheila Cannell, May 2012
The University of Edinburgh

Library Committee

6th June 2012

Agendum 8

Library Services for Online Distance Learners

Brief description of the paper
This paper outlines key factors for the Library in developing Library Services for Online Distance Learners (ODLs) in order to meet the needs of ODL students and anticipate the intended growth in ODL programmes and student numbers. It describes current service provision and outlines future service provision, in particular a pilot postal book loans service for ODLs.

Action requested
Advice on developing Library services for ODLs, in particular a pilot postal book loans service.

Resource implications
Funding is required to expand existing services and to develop new services as appropriate. A bid has been submitted to the Distance Education Initiative Student Experience Working Group for two year funding. Even if this bid is successful, there will be resource implications for the Library budget in future years.

Risk Assessment
The paper has no risk assessment.

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? Yes: it is recommended that a pilot postal book loans service be offered to ODLs at dissertation stage regardless of country of residence.

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper
Barry Croucher, Head of Help Services, IS User Services Division
Frances Abercromby, College Librarian, CHSS, IS User Services Division
Library Services for Online Distance Learners

Introduction

The University is planning to increase substantially its Online Distance Learning (ODL) provision, enabled by the Distance Education Initiative (DEI) launched in November 2010.¹

This paper is submitted to Library Committee to seek advice on developing Library Services for Online Distance Learners, in particular a pilot postal book loans service, in order to meet the needs of ODL students and anticipate the intended growth in ODL programmes and student numbers.²

The key factors for the Library are:
- The unpredictable rate of expansion of ODL programmes and student numbers;
- The unknown impact of increased demand on existing collections and services and their funding;
- Uncertainty over funding for new services;
- Devising and implementing new services which may prove complex and costly to run and may be received by the Library community in a mixed way.

Current service provision

The default mode of delivery of information resources to ODLs is online; document delivery and access to other libraries enhances the availability of materials. Services currently provided include, in order of range and importance:

1. The Digital Library: a wealth of electronic content, free and on subscription, is accessible through authenticated web services, with usage facilitated by resource discovery tools.
2. E-reserve: an online collection of course reading materials including copyright cleared book chapters and journal articles, hosted on a course Virtual Learning Environment.
3. Document delivery: individual students can request a scan of a book chapter or a journal article from Library printed collections; they may also be to apply through the Library to use the British Library document delivery services, or be entitled to use other schemes for inter-library lending.
4. Other libraries: ODLs may have access to other libraries’ print or digital resources through established reciprocal library arrangements or by individual entitlement due to residency or membership of professional organisations, eg NHS.

The Library does not provide a postal book loans service.

Future service provision

Current services will attract increasing demand as new programmes launch and recruitment increases, and new services will also be required. This will require funding.

Funding is being sought from the DEI for 2012/13 and 2013/14. The bid covers increased costs of E-reserve, increased demand from individuals for document scans, equipment costs for scanning, a two year pilot postal book loans service and set up costs. After two years, funding would be required from the Library budget to maintain and grow these services.
To ensure the needs of ODL students are met, the Library, through the Liaison Librarians, must be involved with programme leaders in discussions about resource provision at an early stage of programme development.

There will be increased pressure on current collections as ODLs make use of printed book collections, either through local access if based within reach of Edinburgh or via a pilot postal book loans service.

New methods of acquisition of required materials will be introduced, for example Patron Driven Acquisition, whereby user access to e-books will trigger the purchase of in-demand e-books.

Where there is no e-book version of a core text available to licence, it is expected that alternative core texts are identified, or that core texts will be bought by the students or will be provided by Schools.

Digitisation of out of copyright materials held by the Library may be possible. Where digitisation of a book chapter or journal article is required for a course, E-reserve should be used where appropriate. The growth in demand for E-reserve will have major cost implications in terms of licensing, staff processing time and equipment, as will increased demand for electronic document delivery to individual students.

In addition a pilot postal book loans service is proposed.

**Pilot postal book loans service**

A brief survey of comparator libraries shows that most offer some level of postal book loan service, principally within the UK. **Library Committee is invited to advise IS on the nature of the pilot postal book loans service at the University of Edinburgh by considering the questions and recommendations below.**

Since it will be an expensive service to provide, it should be used as a last resort. For this reason students (assisted if necessary by a Liaison Librarian) must have exhausted all alternative means of obtaining the required content: this may include ODL students discovering and accessing free electronic content such as book chapters on publishers’ websites.

**Who should be entitled to postal loans?**

In order to limit the extent of the service in its pilot phase, and to target the students most in need of the service, it is recommended that the service be made available to ODL students (as identified by the ODL flag in EUCLID) only at the dissertation stage of their programme. In fairness to all students in this grouping, there would be no restriction based on residency, ie overseas students would be entitled to use the service. It is expected that CHSS students would be the main users, whereas CMVM and CSE students would not use the service to any significant extent.
How many postal loans per person should be provided?
The number of loans would depend on funding: the estimated average cost of providing a loan based on demographics of the existing ODL community, which shows that about half of current ODLs are UK based and half are overseas, is c£60 (including staff costs and courier charges). The recommendation is to limit the number of postal loans to 2 items per student.

How should requests be received?
A process to handle requests would be set up, based on an online request form and managed through the Iliad inter-lending system; this requires systems development the cost of which again forms part of the funding bid to DEI. Should requests from students be received directly to the Library, or filtered for approval by programme leaders or dissertation tutors in order to ensure both that the student is entitled and the requested item should be supplied by the Library?

What should be loaned and for how long?
Excluded from the postal loans scheme would be: Reference material, Special Collections, and items on Reserve (3 hour/overnight loans). Standard loans would be included. Should all Short Loan (one week loan) items be included, or should the Main Library HUB collection be excluded?

Since ODLs are Postgraduates, Standard Loans would be issued for 12 weeks and Short Loans would be loaned for 6 weeks (ie 5 weeks longer than normal) without renewal.

How should postal loans be supplied?
In order to ensure the safe delivery and return of posted items, it is recommended they are sent by courier, with tracking in transit, and pre-paid return packaging.

Should users be charged?
It is recommended the service be free to students given the imperative of having the loaned items returned to the Library, taking account of the high fees paid by ODLs, and the difficulty and cost of administering a charged service.

What sanctions can be applied to students for overdue or non-return of items (lost books)?
Charging for overdue loans would be difficult and costly to administer and enforce; therefore it is recommended that information be passed to programme leaders regarding students with large accumulated overdue fines and/or non-returned items. Students would be excluded from making further requests. Programme leaders may wish to consider other sanctions open to them.

How long should the pilot run and how do we assess it?
Depending on funding, it is recommended that the pilot postal loans service runs for two years commencing September 2012. Close monitoring of demand and costs incurred would take place, with an initial review of the service in January 2013 and report submitted to Library Committee soon afterwards. Factors determining continuation of the service would include spend against the allocated budget, the user experience, the return of loaned stock.

Barry Croucher, Head of Help Services, IS User Services Division
Frances Abercromby, CHSS College Librarian, IS User Services Division
28 May 2012
Notes:

1: “The Distance Education Initiative is a University-wide project to substantially increase online distance learning at postgraduate level. The aim of DEI is to reach new postgraduate (including CPD) student audiences by a substantial increase in the number and breadth of courses and programmes offered by the University via online distance education.” (Source: http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/institute-academic-development/learning-teaching/staff/news/dei)

2: A survey for the DEI Student Experience Working Group found that in 2011/12 there were 26 active ODL programmes in EUCLID with 1190 enrolled students; in 2012/13, the Postgraduate Degree Finder currently advertises 40 ODL programmes registered in EUCLID (including 17 new programmes and 3 existing programmes not recruiting). The DEI is also considering new applications for funding programmes. (Source: Projects and reports: ODL Programme numbers (Careers) https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/DistanceEducationInitiative/Community)
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Agendum 9

Update on Projects

Brief description of the paper
This paper gives brief updates on library projects, including ‘Towards Dolly’, Open Journal Publishing, Reading List system, 3 JISC projects and the University Card.

Action requested
For information

Resource implications
Where appropriate the resource implications of the project are noted.

Risk Assessment
There is no risk assessment included in this paper.

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper
Project owners have been listed with each project.
Sheila Cannell
June 2012
1) TOWARDS DOLLY

Towards Dolly will catalogue and preserve records revealing the major role Edinburgh has played in the development of genetics on the world stage. The records include archival and printed material from the Roslin Institute (who famously cloned Dolly the Sheep in 1996), the University’s Institute of Animal Genetics and key geneticists such as Conrad Hal Waddington (1905-1975), Francis Albert Eley Crew (1886-1973) and zoologist James Cossar Ewart (1851-1933).

The records, which will be made available online, are not only invaluable resources for the history of science and medicine, but also as documents of the human stories behind the science. This project paves the way for expanding the genetics holdings in Special Collections and consolidating Edinburgh University Library’s status as an internationally renowned centre for research. The Centre for Research Collections has recently accepted the donation of the papers of Ian Wilmut, with further donations expected from Grahame Bulfield and Noreen McMurray, as it seeks to be the archival centre for the study of the history of genetics at Edinburgh.

Further information is available via the project blog at: www.towardsdolly.wordpress.com

Funding: Wellcome Trust Research Resources in Medical History

PI: Dr Joe Marshall
CoPI: Arnott Wilson
Board Members: Dr John Scally
Norman Rodger
Grant Buttars
Clare Button
Kristy Davies
Professor Grahame Bulfield
Dr Steven Sturdy

John Scally
Director of University Collections

2) OPEN JOURNAL SYSTEM

The Digital Library has been hosting two journals for the past three years (http://www.criticalafricanstudies.ed.ac.uk/ and http://concept.lib.ed.ac.uk/) using the open source 'Open Journal System' (OJS) system. This service has proved to be useful and popular, with one of the current journals having been recently recruited to join the Taylor and Francis family of journals.
In response to a growing demand for a full journal publishing facility we have recently launched this as a service: http://journals.ed.ac.uk/. So far one new journal (The Unfamiliar) has been published, and another is in the pipeline. Enquiries about this service should be directed to information.systems@ed.ac.uk.

Stuart Lewis
Head of Digital Library

3) READING LIST SYSTEM

After a period of consultation and feedback, it has now been decided to purchase the Talis Aspire system. This new facility will allow reading lists to be generated, workflow capabilities to be utilised to allow liaison librarians and materials acquisition staff to review the lists, and students to easily use them via building blocks in the Virtual Learning Environments. Additional features such as statistics of which materials are accessed from a reading list should prove useful.

A short implementation is planned over the coming few months, following which the system will be ready for a limited pilot for the 2012/13 academic year. Please email Stuart Lewis (stuart.lewis@ed.ac.uk) if you are interested in being a pilot user, and to help us shape and develop the service.

Stuart Lewis
Head of Digital Library

4) JISC

The Digital Library teams have recently won three research grants from the JISC:

- The first project was submitted under the innovative JISC Elevator scheme (http://elevator.jisc.ac.uk/). This project is to look at the potential benefits of creating a measure of engagement with Open Access publishing activities, and to define how such an 'Open Access Index' would work. Further details can be found at http://oaindex.org/

- The second project will see us working with the Scottish Confederation of University and Research Libraries (SCURL) to investigate the possibilities and benefits of more fully integrating the Library Management Systems used in Scotland. The project will concentrate on three areas: Users, Content, and Systems.

- The third project will investigate the possibility of creating a register of university-owned research equipment that can be made available in a standardised and interoperable way that would allow it to be integrated into systems such as PURE (to allow the linking of research grants, outputs, and equipment) or to be accessed by external collaborators. This project will delivered in association with staff from EDINA.

Stuart Lewis
Head of Digital Library
5) CARD ACCESS TO THE MAIN LIBRARY

The conversion of Main Library speedlanes from swipe card access to smartcard access will be completed in the week commencing 25 June 2012. The Main Library entrance, the HUB entrance, and the Library café entrance and exit will all be accessible using a smartcard only. This will mean that all users of the Main Library entitled to have card access must have a smartcard. For information about smartcards please visit [http://www.ed.ac.uk/is/smartcard](http://www.ed.ac.uk/is/smartcard).

Barry Croucher
Head of Help Services
Main Library Redevelopment Project Update May 2012

Brief description of the paper
This is one of a regular series of updates on the Main Library redevelopment.

Action requested
For information

Resource implications
Yes, the Main Library redevelopment is a major University capital project.

Risk Assessment
The paper does not include a risk analysis but a risk register is maintained for the project.

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper
Sheila Cannell, Director of Library Services
Lesley Bryson, Main Library Redevelopment Project Co-ordinator
May 2011
Main Library Usage

Since the opening of Floor 4 in February 2012 the Main Library has seen its highest ever usage figures and the summer exam period brought record numbers of users into the building. A headcount of 1,931 was recorded on Sunday 1st May at 15.30, this is the highest concurrent usage recorded to date. Despite increased usage, the additional Floor 4 study space appears to have alleviated some of the pressures felt during 2011 and the building coped well with the busy period. It is expected that usage will continue to rise and the situation will continue to be monitored.

It is forecast that the total footfall for 2001-2012 will reach 2,000,000. This is a significant increase on the pre-redevelopment 2003 figure of 1,044,795.
Lower Ground Floor

All communal areas, office space, book stores, work areas and storage areas on the Lower Ground Floor have now been signed off and planning and design work continues. A number of changes have been made to both east and west office areas to maximise the available space and to ensure that all teams requirements have been met. The AV specification is still awaiting sign off and the colour scheme and other design features are currently being worked on by the Architect.

Regular meetings continue with staff members and planning towards the staff moves will commence at the beginning of the autumn.

Temporary External Accommodation

The Mail Room function continues to operate from external cabins. After some uncertainty over the functionality of the external hoist a number of adjustments have been made, including a widened lift entrance and raised support rails. To improve efficiency and make the best use of the available temporary space, arrangements have been made with external delivery contractors for deliveries to be made directly to the Main Library main entrance where possible.

Temporary Closure of Main Library Stairwells and Lifts

During the summer months work will commence on the refurbishment of the three Main Library stair wells and the replacement of the lifts—as part of the last phase of works in the Main Library. Although it was always intended that the stairs would be redeveloped towards the end of the project, the redevelopment of the lifts was not originally anticipated, but is now necessary because the lifts have been so heavily used during the redevelopment.

The central stair will close for refurbishment on Monday 4th June and there will be no access to the central stair for approximately 8 weeks.

During the works all floors will remain fully accessible with no more than one stair and one lift closed for development works at any given time. Access to the upper floors during the closure of the central stair will be by the lifts, forum staircase or the east or west stairs as appropriate. Work will continue until early 2013 but in an effort to keep disruption to a minimum full stair closures will be restricted where possible to the summer months.

On-going Facilities and Services Issues

All water fountains in the Main Library are currently operational and arrangements have been made for regular checks during busy periods.

Work to clean the chill beams on all floors of the building commenced during the Easter vacation. This work will be completed during the quiet summer period.
Throughout redevelopment work, we will keep you up to date with progress and regular construction updates are available on the MLRP website - [www.ed.ac.uk/is/mlrp](http://www.ed.ac.uk/is/mlrp). Plasma screens in the Library are also updated regularly.

If you have any queries, please contact mlrp@ed.ac.uk.

Lesley Bryson, Main Library Redevelopment Coordinator
Sheila Cannell, Director of Library and Collections
29 May 2012
Edinburgh University Library Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 11 APRIL 2012
AT 2pm IN ROOM 1.11, MAIN LIBRARY.

Present: Prof David Finnegan (Convenor)
Mrs Sheila Cannell
Dr Alex Murdoch
Dr Iain Murray
Mrs Elspeth Currie
Mr Richard Battersby
Dr John Scally
Professor Dai Hounsell
Mr George McKenzie
Ms Irene McGowan
Mr Abdul Majothi
Ms Susan Graham

In attendance: Mr Cameron Murdoch (on behalf of HSS)
Mrs Helen Murphie (note taker)
Miss Michele Bain (note taker)

Apologies: Mrs Fiona Brown
Mr John Gales
Professor David Fergusson
Mrs Janet Rennie
Dr Anna Kenway
Mr Mike Williamson
Professor Jeff Haywood
Dr Steven Morley
Mr Stuart Lewis
Professor Simon Parsons

Freedom of Information: this minute is “open” for FOI purposes unless specifically indicated for an individual section/paragraph. Similarly the papers for this meeting are “open”, unless specifically indicated.

1. Welcome

David Finnegan acted as Convenor for this meeting in the absence of Jeff Haywood.

2. Convenor and Director of Library Service Business

The Convenor noted the following points:

The next meeting would be Sheila Cannell’s last before her retirement. An interview panel for her successor has been confirmed with two externals, and interviews are to be held in mid June.

The IS Plan has been accepted at the annual planning round. IS has received an uplift of 3% plus an additional 0.5% for the personal tutor system. In addition IS will receive extra funding for library collections, research data storage and management services, management information/business intelligence, distance education and the University website.
Integration of Edinburgh College of Art (ECA) in the University with regard to the Library service continues to go well. Work on ECA collections will continue for some time. John Scally added that the ECA materials were quite substantial, and that the rare books were being catalogued.

The announcement was made yesterday that the Wellcome Trust is working with the Howard Hughes Institute in US and Max Planck Institute in Germany on the issue of a new Open Access biological journal which will be significant in changing the way work is published and accessed.

Sheila Cannell reported on an exit survey of the Main Library which was carried out over three days in March. Many students were outside because of the warm weather, but this was an interesting survey on what users were doing in the Library. There were 800 respondents from 71 countries, with 85% of students calling the Library ‘good’ or ‘very good’. Few issues were reported with finding seats. Data is still being analysed and more information will be reported in due course.

Items for discussion:

3. Paper A, Collections Review

Sheila Cannell apologised that there was no paper available for today’s meeting because the Collections Review convened by VP Nigel Brown had not yet been formally signed off. However it will be made available to Library Committee as soon as possible. The paper is in two parts, a report with recommendations and a substantial set of appendices. The Review Group identified a shortfall of £1m in expenditure. Our expenditure does not meet the aspirations of the University, and is low in comparison with major comparator universities. The review also considered that there are new ways in which additional funding could be spent to directly support users. The University has approved £0.5m additional funding through the planning round. Jeff Haywood and Sheila Cannell will meet with Heads of College and College Registrars to discuss proposals for meeting the residual shortfall of £0.5m and will report back to Library Committee at the June meeting.

A discussion followed on the use of e-resources. Dai Hounsell pointed out the use of e-journals and websites to download material for free and questioned the extent to which students or staff are greater users of this wider digital library. Sheila Cannell answered that although the number of people using the Library printed resources continues to rise, use per person has gone down slightly, while at the same time use of e-resources has been going up by 30% every year. This issue will be discussed further once the Collections Review paper is made available.

4. Paper B, LibQual Survey: actions being taken

Richard Battersby gave an update on further actions being taken with regard to the LibQual Survey completed in November 2011. These fall under the three broad headings of Services, Collections and Library as Place. It is intended that a summary of this paper will be made available on the IS website and in University Libraries. We are still waiting for LibQual results on a College basis. Once this has been completed a summary will be made available to the Library Committee. The Committee commended the responsiveness of the Library to the findings in this survey.

5. Paper C, University Strategic Plan

Sheila Cannell invited discussion on issues in the Strategic Plan which is currently being developed for submission to GASP for inclusion in the Plan. She drew attention in particular to the themes of Learning, Research, Knowledge Exchange and Infrastructure.

- The Committee discussed the issue of accessibility of e-journals to alumni and the difficulties around this. Sheila Cannell will consider how access can be enhanced.
• Alex Murdoch commented that we have a very rich Collection and it is important that this is recognised in the Strategic Plan as an important part of what the University offers.

• Dai Hounsell noted that if an issue is not included in the Strategic Plan it can be difficult to make a case for it in the future.

Sheila Cannell noted that IS will develop its own more detailed plan once the University’s Strategic Plan is in place, and advised members to get in touch with GASP with any other specific issues.

6. Paper D, A University-wide framework for managing our research data: establishing a Research Data Storage and Management (RDM & RDS) Service

Sheila Cannell spoke about this increasingly important issue that the University is required to address. This paper forms part of the IS Plan and has been approved for funding from the planning round for next year. The first issue to address is about storage and how to help people manage their data. But this also concerns the services to support research data management and the issue of how people are appropriately trained. It is also necessary to think about longer term access and preservation using archival skills to decide what should be curated into the future.

Alex Murdoch raised the issue around resources which become obsolete very quickly. George Mackenzie added that a lot of this relates to information issues and is about getting the right information handling procedures in place and then the technical issues will fall into place. Archivists know that it is as important to decide what data not to preserve, as to decide what data to keep. Elspeth Currie added that research groups are often unsure about what is the correct thing to do and often keep multiple copies and worry about space issues, so training would be very helpful. The Committee also discussed the issue of ownership of data, in particular belonging to graduate students.

Sheila Cannell advised there would be self-help on the web, as well as training from consultancy teams.

Reports:

7. Paper E, Library materials budget updates

Sheila Cannell explained that this paper was in relation to this year’s budget, not next year. Small additional allocations will be made to each of the Colleges from the funds which had been withheld at the start of the session to support need. It was noted that one College, CS&E, was already overspent.

8. Paper F, Update on projects

John Seally advised the Committee on progress on several projects which were underway:

• Continuing process of engagement with UKRR regarding collaborative retention on print journals available in digital format.
• Impressive numbers of research outputs are being added into the PURE system.
• E-thesis digitisation services are being trialled at the Annexe, based on demand led for particular theses.
• For resource discovery, we have now confirmed the contract with EBSCO Discovery Service.
• The University card has been very successful and useful for everyone and is being installed at Library entrances.
• We are close to signing up with Talis for the reading list project—this is a cloud based system to manage reading lists. There will be a soft launch for next session with a small number of courses, and it is expected to grow during next session.

9. Building and opening hours report

a. Paper G, Main Library Redevelopment update

Sheila Cannell stated that this paper was for information. There will be a major paper about the redevelopment, reviewing progress, at the end of the public facing works at the next Committee Meeting. This paper will also review outstanding issues.

b. Paper H, King's Building Library update

Richard Battersby reported on significant developments in KB Library and study space this summer.

- New KB Library is scheduled to open in July/August.
- Reconfiguration of the upper floor of the Darwin Library.
- JCMB and Robertson Libraries will be closing.
- Transfer of helpdesk services from the Darwin Library to the KB Library.

The outcome of all of this will mean that by the end of the summer there will be three study hubs at KB. All information will be made available on KB Library web pages in due course. He noted that a firm completion date was still awaited from the contractors. The aim is to reduce disruption to users over the summer.

c. Law and LLC feasibility projects – verbal update

Sheila Cannell advised that it is very important that the Library Committee is aware that every time a School decides to do something about their space it may have implications for the Library and any class libraries. The School of Literature Languages and Culture is moving to the 50 George Square (previously William Robertson Building); and the School of Law is undertaking a feasibility study which will require the move of the Law Library. In both cases library space for collections will be an issue. It is quite likely that some books will need to be moved to the Library Annex and the Committee should be aware of how important the Annex is, not just as a facility for the Main Library, but also for Schools around the University.

10. College Library Committee reports

a) College of SE – [http://www.library.sceieng.ed.ac.uk](http://www.library.sceieng.ed.ac.uk)

Richard Battersby advised on the two main issues discussed at the meeting of the SE Library Committee, which were the review of changes at KB this summer and the Collections Review.

b) College of MVM – [http://www.lc.mvm.ed.ac.uk](http://www.lc.mvm.ed.ac.uk)

Irene McGowan reported on a ventilation issue at the help desk in the Lady Smith of Kelvin Veterinary Library (LSKVL) which the architects are looking into. User registrations with NHS Lothian staff have declined this year due to NHS staff having increased access to online resources from the Knowledge Network, but NHS staff are requesting more information skills training than before.
c) College of HSS- http://www.clc.hss.ed.ac.uk
Cameron Murdoch had nothing to report.

11. EUSA report

No representation.

12. Minutes and matters arising

Susan Graham noted that she had given apologies for the February meeting. This has now been amended in the Minutes. Spelling mistake of Abdul Majothi’s name has also been corrected.

Regarding Agenda Item 11 from the Minutes of 6 February, Sheila Cannell reported that the water fountains were now working.

13. Any other Business

Sheila Cannell advised that items from the University of Edinburgh Special Collections are featured in the “Hajj: Journey to the heart of Islam” exhibition in the British Museum.

John Scally reminded the committee of the Masterpieces II exhibition in the Main Library.

14. Date of next meeting

6 June, 10.30am, Room 1.11 (note change of date and time due to public holiday).
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Schedule of Meetings 2012/13

Brief description of the paper
The paper proposes a schedule of meeting dates for the coming year.

Action requested
For approval and noting

Resource implications
None

Risk Assessment
N/A

Equality and Diversity
Does the paper have equality and diversity implications? No

Freedom of Information
Can this paper be included in open business? Yes

Originator of the paper
Liz Petrie
Secretary
The Committee is requested to note and approve the following schedule of dates, times and venues for meetings in the year 2012/13:

- Wednesday 10 October 2012  2pm  Library Meeting Room Suite 1.09
- Wednesday 5 December 2012  2pm  Library Meeting Room Suite 1.09
- Wednesday 6 February 2013  2pm  Library Meeting Room Suite 1.07
- Wednesday 10 April 2013    2pm  Library Meeting Room Suite 1.07
- Wednesday 5 June 2013      2pm  Library Meeting Room Suite 1.07