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University Library Collections Policy 2013: Key Policy Statements
Paper A

Brief description of the paper
This is the latest iteration of the Library Collections Policy’s Revised Key Policy Statements, following feedback at the last Library Committee and College Library Committees. Any final comments are welcome, before the formal sign off at the June Library Committee.

Action requested
For final comment.

Resource implications
Does the paper have resource implications? No

Risk Assessment
Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity
Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes

There are no apparent impacts that would be detrimental to equality legislation. The Library continues to facilitate support for users who may require adjustments for access to locations or resources.

Any other relevant information
Amendments made to previous paper as a result of comments at last Library Committee meeting.

Additional consultations have been carried out with College Librarians, and individual School Liaison Librarians for comment from Schools.

Originator of the paper
John Scally, Director of Library & University Collections
Laura Macpherson, Library General Collections & Services Manager

Freedom of information
Can this paper be included in open business? Yes
University Library Collections Policy Key Policy Statements

2013 Refresh

[Format: each policy statement is followed by an explanatory note or clarification to aid interpretation]

Background
The current set of key policy statements originate in the substantial Library Collections Policy document approved in 2005 and a subsequent light-touch review of the policy completed in 2009. Much of what we agreed in 2005 and 2009 still holds and has served the library and its community well during a period of considerable change. The current refreshing of the key policy statements contains nothing that would move us away from our overarching principle of providing library resources suitable for a diverse community of disciplines in a research intensive university. However, this refreshed set of Key Policy Statements will allow us to keep up with developments, especially in the area of e-books and research data management.

Key Policy Statements:

1. The Library will provide a dynamic, relevant and evolving collection of resources to support teaching and research in the University and, where possible, in the wider community. This will be supported by established as well as new methods of acquisition.
   - An established model would include academic purchase recommendations; new methods could include patron driven acquisition.
   - This is aimed at the General Collections, but also Heritage and Special Collections.

2. The most heavily used print General Collections are openly accessible and located where they can best be utilised by the greatest concentration of users.
   - Items in store will have demonstrated lower usage than the centrally located collections.
   - Stored items remain available through appropriately managed request and delivery services.
   - Items may also be transferred across the Main and Site Libraries on behalf of users. Material tends to be located on the campus where specific subjects are taught (for example, the veterinary collections are predominantly held within the Library at the Easter Bush campus).

3. The Library follows an e-only model in relation to acquisition and retention of journals, taking into account financial feasibility, content, and long-term access.
4. The Library follows an e-preference model in relation to the acquisition and retention of books, taking into account financial feasibility, access arrangements, discipline requirements, learning needs and preservation.

- The Library will invest in and support initiatives to improve access arrangements and pricing of e-books.
- For disciplines for which print copies are essential for teaching and/or research, both print and electronic books will be acquired. The decision will normally lie with the appropriate Academic colleague and Liaison Librarian representing the discipline concerned.

5. Heritage and Special Collections are acquired according to existing collection strengths and research and teaching priorities.

- Material is normally purchased using endowments, support from Friends organisations, the Schools and Colleges, and through external fundraising.
- The selection policy for Rare Books and Manuscripts is available here: http://edin.ac/XtERQD
- The University Archives Collecting Policy is available here: http://edin.ac/XtEZQ4
- The Museums and Galleries Collections Policy (2010-15) is available here: http://edin.ac/10jtjgX

6. The Library collects and preserves the intellectual output of the University and its archival record in manuscript, print and electronic format, through services such as the Edinburgh Research Archive (ERA), the Current Research Information System (PURE), and the University Archives.

- Policies relating to ERA and PURE can be found here: http://edin.ac/10UT3AW
- The University Archives Collecting Policy is available here: http://edin.ac/XtFhq7

7. The Library will collaborate with stakeholders to implement the Research Data Management (RDM) Policy and develop a service for the management and reuse (retention and availability) of University of Edinburgh Research Data, to ensure compliance with Research Councils’ and external funding bodies’ requirements.

- The RDM Policy may be viewed here: http://edin.ac/10jtRmV
8. Donations, or internal transfers (e.g. School collection transfers), of books, manuscripts and archives will be assessed using selection criteria and/ or records retention schedules that will be applied before accepting material.

- For further details on criteria relating to Rare Books and Manuscripts donations, view the acquisitions policy here: http://edin.ac/XtERQD
- Examples of selection criteria include duplication; availability elsewhere; material condition; and relevance to current teaching or research. The decision will normally lie with the Liaison Librarian representing the discipline concerned.
- Donations are subject to the same on-going review process as all other materials, in relation to collections management activities such as transfer, relegation or disposal.

9. Deposits will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances and under agreed conditions.

- Deposited collections are not owned by the University of Edinburgh, but are held and serviced on behalf of the owners.
- The Library will normally apply a charge for the housing and servicing of deposited collections.

10. No more than one copy of a title (print or electronic) will normally be added to or retained within the Library system, unless it falls into the following categories.

- The text is being used in current or continuing courses at the University of Edinburgh. In which case, the Library would not normally purchase or retain more than one copy per group of 20 students on a course.
- Current research requirements mean that more than one copy should be purchased to be available across multiple Site Libraries.
- Additional copies have copy specific information and would be part of the Special Collections.
- All multiple copies of items are reviewed as part of a rolling programme of collections management.

11. Where we have guaranteed long-term access to electronic journals, the print copy of the same title will be assessed for transfer, relegation or disposal.

- By ‘guaranteed access’ we mean that the item will be available at the point of need; by ‘long-term’ we mean that the electronic copy is included in a backfiles portfolio or is available via community-owned preservation services.
- The Library will continue to purchase journal back files when resources are available.
- The Library will continue its membership of the LOCKSS and PORTICO preservation services.
As long as they are available, the Library will endeavour to retain membership of responsible and collaborative preservation and retention programmes, such as the UK Research Reserve (UKRR). These programmes seek to maintain a national collection of print journals now available electronically.

In many instances, publishers are no longer making print editions of journals available. The Library seeks to preserve access to the electronic editions through schemes mentioned above.

12. There is a rolling programme of transfer, relegation and disposal (using agreed criteria) for Library collections. Within the General Collections, an approximate balance will be sought between acquisition on the one hand, and transfer, relegation and disposal on the other.

Examples of criteria include that used within the HUB (High Use Books) collection in the Main Library, where materials no longer required for taught courses or no longer demonstrating high borrowing are usually de-duplicated, and transferred into the main Standard Loan collection.

Disposals are carried out in consultation with the College or Liaison Librarian representing the discipline(s) concerned.

13. Access agreements with and proximity to other libraries will be factored into decisions on the acquisition and retention of specialist categories of material.

For example, the Library no longer routinely acquires maps due to our co-location to the National Library of Scotland’s Map Library.

Approved by Library Committee, d/m/y

Knowledge Strategy Committee, d/m/y
Brief description of the paper
The paper provides a further update on the current expenditure of the Collections Review allocation, 2012-13.
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Collections Review – update on pilots in new methods of acquisition

Background
One of the key recommendations of the Collections Review Report (2012) agreed by Library Committee in June 2012 and by University Court was the piloting of innovative, user-centred methods of acquisition. Recurrent funding has been made available to IS over 3 years to pilot services and activities in key areas of materials acquisition.

It is anticipated that these pilots will help the Library to develop and deliver robust, user-driven collection development in response to identified needs.

Progress in the development and implementation of new pilot areas of activity is summarised below. As implementation has been slower than anticipated in some areas, an estimate of likely financial year-end expenditure is given, along with recommendations for adjustments to the initial pilot year budget allocations in 2012/13.

The four key strands of pilot activity are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot activity</th>
<th>Initial Budget Allocation</th>
<th>Expend/Commit to 31.3.13</th>
<th>Balance at 31.3.13</th>
<th>Revised Budget Allocation</th>
<th>Est. FYE spend*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interlibrary Loans - reducing cost to the user</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of pilot service to provide quotas of free interlibrary loans to staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patron driven acquisition – e-books</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>£42,700</td>
<td>£127,300</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of a pilot service for students and academics to enable quick/seamless on-demand access to a wide range of e-book content not previously owned by the Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Patron driven acquisition - student requests</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>£11,000</td>
<td>£89,000</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment of existing student book request service to reduce level of mediation and speed delivery of resources in response to student needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Journal and Interdisciplinary resource pilots</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>£117,500</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of existing Open Access subscriptions, funding of interdisciplinary resources, and piloting of user driven article purchase with selected publishers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Estimated financial year-end expenditure shown here is based on actions as outlined in recommendations listed below. This includes adjustment of initial budget allocation in the PDA Student Requests pilot by redeploying £80,000 the Journal and Interdisciplinary Resource pilots strand.
1. **Interlibrary Loans (ILL) - reducing the cost to the user**

- The pilot service to provide quotas of free interlibrary loans to staff and students has been in place since 1st August 2012.

- Initial analysis of the first quarter has revealed a modest increase in uptake of the service, and increased undergraduate registration for the service as at the same point last year. By the end of the second quarter use of the service remained in line with the same period last year.

- Postgraduate research students are the heaviest users of the service, and there continues to be a marked increase in undergraduate registration, but not all follow through with interlibrary loans requests.

**Recommendation 1 – Interlibrary Loans**

_Uptake of the Inter-Library Loan service will be monitored closely in quarters 3 and 4. It is anticipated that demand will increase, leading to higher Interlibrary Loan expenditure from College library funds. Therefore, it may be necessary to supplement College ILL funds by up to £14,000 from this budget, to maintain service provision._

_Use of the service will continue to be analysed, to inform recommendations for quota levels for 2013/14._

_There has been a successful trial of Proquest Dissertations and Theses full text service during January-March. Subject to costs, it is proposed that in 2012/13 we fund an initial 18 month subscription (estimated cost £36K) which will reduce demand for ILL in this area, and will further improve service provision for researchers._

2. **Patron-driven acquisition (PDA) – e-books**

- A key strand of work over the last few months has been a review of the three major e-book suppliers (aggregators) in the Scottish academic library e-book procurement framework agreement to determine the most appropriate PDA partner.

- Academic publishers have recently imposed a number of changes on e-book aggregators, including limiting concurrent user access, or, in some cases removal of significant amounts of textbook content from aggregator platforms. Combined with e-book supplier mergers, the academic e-book marketplace is currently in considerable flux, and these wider changes have delayed the selection of an e-book supplier with whom we will partner on our PDA pilot project.

- It is still anticipated that the PDA pilot with aggregator content will be implemented before the end of academic session 2012/13, with selected e-books available in the Library catalogue for discovery and access by academic staff and students via rental and/or purchase. Expenditure via user demand to financial year end is not expected to exceed £20,000.

- A one year subscription to a SHEDL Cambridge Books Online deal has been funded from this strand. This will provide patron-selected usage data, allowing evidence-
based decisions on future publisher e-book deals, and is important as it is anticipated that SHEDL will offer further opportunities for e-book agreements in 2013/14.

- Additionally, discussions are underway with a number of STM publishers who are bringing patron-driven plans to the marketplace, allowing a different model for libraries to purchase or lease content direct from them rather than via aggregators. Publishers include Elsevier, Wiley Blackwell and De Gruyter.

**Recommendation 2 - Patron-driven acquisition (PDA) – e-books**

As uptake of the PDA e-book service is expected to be very high in Semesters 1 and 2 of academic session 2013/14, it is recommended that any unspent funds from this strand of activity towards the end of financial year 2012/13 are deposited with selected publisher and aggregator PDA partners.

3. **Patron-driven acquisition (PDA) – student requests**

- The PDA Working Group has introduced a new back-office workflow to reduce levels of mediation in the existing Student Book Suggestion service, and this will improve speed of delivery of content to users.

- The Acquisitions Team now directly handle student requests, automatically progressing purchase within parameters agreed with Liaison Librarians (e.g. relevant academic level, price cap etc.). The only exception is requests for medical texts which continue be closely scrutinised and approved by relevant Liaison Librarians.

- Creation of this new central purchasing fund has removed significant pressure from individual school book allocations within the Materials Budget, and has allowed almost all student requests to be satisfied (previously, student requests were only actioned by Liaison Librarians when relevant school book funds allowed).

- Analysis of the 260 student requests which have been received since the start of Semester 1 (via the existing online Student book Suggestion Form), shows that 95% were submitted by students in HSS, with 5% from CS&E, and 1 request from MVM.

- The majority of requests continue to be submitted by post-graduate students, with over a third of requests submitted for PhD studies - very few requests are for titles on undergraduate reading lists.

- Over 170 items have been acquired to date and combined with c.100 orders in process, this accounts for c.£11,000 to end March 2013.

- An e-book preference policy is in place for these requests, with an e-copy being purchased instead of print when content is available in electronic format.

- A redesigned Student Book Suggestion form will be implemented by the end of April, and the re-branded service will be widely marketed across all three Colleges to ensure maximum visibility, and to encourage greater student uptake.
Recommendation 3 - Patron-driven acquisition (PDA) – student requests

The budget allocation of £100,000 for the Student Requests pilot was set during the Collections Review in the context of annual student request purchase levels at a comparator university library. However, demand within our own institution has not met this initial expectation, although it is expected to increase in the final quarter of the current financial year when the re-branded service is marketed.

As it is anticipated that this initial pilot year budget allocation will not be fully spent in 2012/13, it is recommended that unspent funding (est. £69,000) be invested in the journal pilot strand (see 4. below), including purchase of e-journal backsets in 2012/13.

It is further recommended that a lower budget allocation be set for PDA Student Requests in 2013/14.

4. Journal and interdisciplinary resource pilots

- A number of key journal titles and Open Access subscriptions have been funded by this additional budget allocation, including Biomed Central; Faculty of 1000 Biology; Faculty of 1000 Medicine; Nucleic Acids Research; and Public Library of Science (PLOS). A subscription to Scopus has been funded, as a key interdisciplinary resource which is also being used in the REF.

- On-demand article purchasing from a range of publishers is also being investigated, and the costs of this type of service will be compared with those of traditional document delivery.

Recommendation 4 - Journal and interdisciplinary resource pilots

Using 2012/13 budget allocation re-directed from the PDA Student Request strand of activity (est. £69,000), it is recommended that on-demand article purchasing from a range of publishers be progressed in the latter part of 2012/13, and purchase of relevant interdisciplinary resources and e-journal backsets undertaken.

Elize Rowan – Acquisitions & Metadata Services Manager
Liz Stevenson – E-Resources Manager
3 April 2013
Progress report on the RCUK-BIS Open Access programme

Paper D

Brief description of the paper
This paper provides an introduction to the RCUK Open Access implementation project and reports on progress made to date.
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Equality and Diversity
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Progress report on the RCUK-BIS Open Access programme

1. Summary
   - Project will ensure that appropriate staff and processes are in place to enable compliance with the new RCUK Open Access Policy
   - Staffing: Project Manager – Theo Andrew, Project Assistant – Mike Bryce.
   - New Open Access webpages at www.ed.ac.uk/is/open-access-research
   - Good progress has been made by Colleges in recruiting publication assistants for uploading green OA documents to PURE. The first set of training sessions led by project staff will be carried out in April.
   - All RCUK-funded principle investigators have been informed of the new open access policy by email.
   - The Library has set up an Open Access support service for the University, and has already successfully answered a number of enquiries.
   - £150k worth of savings has been identified for managing future Gold OA costs.

2. Introduction
   A new RCUK open access policy, which started on 1st April 2013, states that RCUK “expect authors of research papers to maximise the opportunities to make their results available for free”. Resources have been provided to support this process in the form of a transitional grant (£609K) from the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS) to be spent in the 2013 calendar year. The decision was taken by the Research Policy Group to spend this money on developing and embedding green open access (i.e. repository deposit) within the University, rather than spend it on gold open access (i.e. paid-for publisher services). The Library is co-ordinating this work on behalf of the University and has set up a project with the following aims and objectives:
   1. Put in place appropriate policies, staff and processes to ensure compliance with the RCUK open access policy.
   2. Develop systems to ensure that providing green open access copies of publications is an easy task for authors and support staff.
   3. Ensure the open access options chosen by authors are provided in the most cost-effective manner.

3. Staffing
   Information Services has seconded a Project Manager (Theo Andrew) from the Library to lead the implementation programme. A Project Assistant (Mike Bryce) has been successfully recruited and started work in February. Together they are providing dedicated training and support to research administration staff in the Colleges so they can load the green open access content into PURE with minimal delays. The Library is also in the process of securing a secondment for an existing staff member within IS to fill a software developer post. This role will develop and provide web services to reuse content from PURE so it can easily be used elsewhere, for example, on departmental and researcher webpages, or in automatically creating academic CVs. The project is also funding a number of other posts within the University described below.

Humanities and Social Sciences: The College Office is recruiting six full-time publications assistants on a fixed term until December 2013. The posts have been scoped, graded and authorised and are now being advertised on the jobs.ed.ac.uk website. The closing date for applications is 12th April and they hope to have people in place by May. The College is significantly supplementing the project money with its own. In addition it is creating a new College Open Access Research Advisor post, for two years, to manage the temporary staff in the first instance, and then to provide continuity beyond that.
**Science and Engineering:** The College Office is splitting its allocation evenly between schools who are each taking a different approach. Some units, like the School of Informatics, who operate a central support model and have research support staff in place, are redeploying people to work on the project and will able to start in April. The School of Biological Sciences has someone in place ready to take up the appointment but are waiting on contracts being issued. Other units who currently do not have the spare capacity are looking to create new posts.

**Medicine & Veterinary Medicine:** The College Office is actively seeking to appoint 2 full-time staff for 6 months to work on the project. Because of the high demand from other units the UoE Talent Register does not look like an option for recruitment so they will have to advertise or use a temping agency.

**3. Open access webpages have been updated**
A process to improve the University’s open access web pages has started, and can be seen at http://www.ed.ac.uk/is/open-access-research. Information has been updated regarding the new RCUK policy. Enhancements are currently underway, including step-by-step graphical PURE upload guides, and information about each of the main publishers’ policies about green open access.

**4. Informing researchers**
All of the RCUK principal investigators who are affected by the new RCUK open access policy have been identified and have been sent an email. The email has been deliberately kept short and to the point: it includes details of the policy, what action is needed, and what support is available. It has been suggested that this information should be sent to all research-active staff, and we are investigating the best way to do this, e.g. the use of all-staff list, or cascading via College Offices.

**5. Open Access publisher deals scoped**
The Library has identified a number of publisher membership schemes that give the University significant discounts and benefits through discounted APCs and prepay plans. The project team has analysed the main deals and found that, if the University joined the top 5 open access membership schemes, the representative savings would be £149,780.98 (18% of the block grant). This is only possible with a central institutional publication fund in place.

**6. Training materials developed**
The open access implementation programme team has developed a suite of materials for School and College support staff to help train them to have an understanding of versioning, copyright and journal publisher policies (what copies to use and when). This training course material includes hand-outs and screencasts. Information for researchers has also been produced with a series of how-to guides available from the open access webpages.

**7. Support service in operation**
The Scholarly Communications team in the Library, now led by Dominic Tate, is providing a pilot central support service which acts as a one-stop-shop of open access enquiries. Researchers or administrative staff can contact the team who will offer advice or hands-on support relating to any aspect of open access – including guidance on understanding the various research funders’ open access policies, pointing researchers to funding streams available for Gold OA (RCUK or Wellcome Trust), helping academic authors to realise their Green OA options (including mediated deposit in institutional, subject or funders repositories), or interpreting and solving the various copyright and licensing issues. This service is available now via email (rps-help@ed.ac.uk) or telephone (651 3850) during core office hours.
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Extending Library Opening Hours to Address Students' Needs

Summary
In response to EUSA requests for longer Main Library building opening hours in the Summer Teaching Vacation in order to address students’ needs, IS will fund an increase in hours commencing June 2013. The total increase in hours over the Summer is 194 hours.

Student feedback has highlighted the need for more evening opening at Moray House Library from mid-August 2013, and for an extension of opening hours at that site and at the Law & Europa Library in the third week of Winter vacation 2014: IS intends to effect these extensions, if servitorial cover can be provided by the respective Schools. The total increase in hours across the two sites is 81 hours.

The cost to IS of these changes is estimated to be £17,000 in 2013/14.

Main Library
At Library Committee on 5th December 2012 Paper C was presented giving an Update on Library Opening Hours. This paper confirms the extension of Main Library building opening hours during the Summer period to meet the needs of several user groups: part-time students, UGs undertaking resits, the growing number of PGT students at dissertation stage; PGR students; Medical students. (IS Helpdesk and Centre for Research Collections service hours remain unchanged.)

The changes to Main Library Summer 2013 opening are:
1. Sunday 9am opening will be maintained for an additional 4 Sundays until the end of June 2013 to meet the needs of Medical students being examined after that the main exam diet ends on 24th May, resulting in a net total increase of 9 hours.

2. For the third week of June, maintain building opening hours as per Semester pattern: this is an increase in opening hours of 71 hours over the existing Summer opening pattern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Current Summer building opening hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Current Semester building opening hours</th>
<th>Increase in hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Thursday</td>
<td>08:30 to 20:00</td>
<td>Monday to Thursday</td>
<td>07:30 to 02:30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>08:30 to 17:00</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>07:30 to 02:30</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00-13:00</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>07:30 to 02:30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12:00 to 02:30</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. For the fourth week of June, all of July and the first week of September (7 weeks in total) when the Summer pattern of opening applies, increase opening hours by 12 hours per week, or 84 hours over the 7 weeks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Current building opening hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Revised building opening hours</th>
<th>Increase in hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>08:30 to 17:00</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>08:30 to 20:00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00-13:00</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00 to 17:00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12:00 to 17:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edinburgh University Library Committee

4. For August, increase opening hours by 6 hours per week, a total of 30 hours over the 5 weeks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Current building opening hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Revised building opening hours</th>
<th>Increase in hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>08:30 to 17:00</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>08:30 to 20:00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00-17:00</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00 to 20:00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moray House Library and Law & Europa Library**

While reviewing Main Library opening hours, consideration was also given to issues arising with opening hours at two central area site libraries.

Law & Europa Library: the University Semester dates determine that there is a full week of vacation at the beginning of January, which is reflected in site library opening hours. Winter opening hours are restricted during weekdays and there is no weekend opening until the start of Teaching Block 3. Academic hand-in dates for 3rd and 4th Year Law students were set for the first day of Teaching Block 3. EUSA VPAA has highlighted this issue and students complained in January 2013 about limited access to subject print resources.

Moray House Library: a similar situation as described above for Law pertains regarding Winter opening hours; in addition, PGDE students commence third week of August, the library opens two evenings per week to 8pm as a result, and opens fully from Freshers' Week, but PGDE students have repeatedly asked for extended opening in the intervening three weeks.

Treating the third week of Winter vacation as per Semester at these two libraries would increase access to print resources for Law and Education students with hand-in dates set for the start of Semester 2. Longer opening in the second half of August and first week of September would assist School of Education PGDEs who are starting their course.

The proposed changes to Moray House Library Summer opening are:

5. For the last two weeks of August and first week of September 2013, increase opening hours by a total of 6 hours per week, or 18 hours over the 3 weeks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Current library opening hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Revised library opening hours</th>
<th>Increase in hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>09:00 to 17:00</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>09:00 to 20:00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>09:00 to 17:00</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>09:00 to 20:00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed changes to Moray House Library and Law & Europa Library Winter opening are:

6. For the week of 6th January 2014, open as per Semester, an increase of 33 hours at Law & Europa Library and 30 hours at Moray House Library:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Current library opening hours</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Revised library opening hours</th>
<th>Increase in hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Thursday</td>
<td>09:00 to 17:00</td>
<td>Monday to Thursday</td>
<td>09:00 to 22:00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>09:00 to 19:00 (Law) and to 17:00 (Moray House)</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>09:00 to 19:00 (Law) and to 17:00 (Moray House)</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>09:00 (Law) and 12:00 (Moray House) to 17:00</td>
<td>8 hours at Law and 5 hours at Moray House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12:00 to 17:00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resources

Extending Main Library, Law & Europa Library and Moray House Library opening hours as detailed above will require additional IS Facilities resource to provide Reception/Building cover and additional Library & Collections shelving activity (Main Library), additional User Services resource to provide IS Helpdesk services (Law and Moray House libraries), and will incur additional utility charges.

Resource implications for IS of extending Library opening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Cost</td>
<td>£8,500*</td>
<td>£17,000</td>
<td>£17,750</td>
<td>£18,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, extending opening hours at Law & Europa Library and Moray House Library as detailed above would also require Schools to provide servitorial cover and utilities. Discussion is to be had with the two Schools concerned.

Barry Croucher, Head of Help Services, IS User Services, 27/03/2013
Improving Main Library access for visitors
Paper F

Brief description of the paper
This paper gives notice of a change to Main Library access arrangements intended to make the Library more welcoming to visitors wishing to visit for the day.

Action requested
For information.

Resource implications
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Risk Assessment
Does the paper include a risk analysis? No

Equality and Diversity
Has due consideration been given to the equality impact of this paper? Yes
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This paper is a work in progress. The final paper will require an EqIA. The final paper and accompanying EqIA is to be presented to the Library Committee on 5 June.
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Barry Croucher, Head of Help Services, IS User Services; 25/03/2013.
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Improving Main Library access for visitors

Incidents arising at the Main Library Reception suggest that a greater degree of discretion might be entrusted to staff at Reception (comprising IS Help Services, IS Facilities, and Estates & Buildings) in order to empower them to permit entry in some cases, when the criteria for admission are not met. This discretion would include admitting users for the day who wish to join but have partial credentials and need to return to complete their membership, or visitors who have no interest in being members but have reasonable purpose and can identify themselves, or who are vouched for by a member of the University. The changes will result in the Main Library being more flexible and welcoming to visitors wishing to access the Library for the day or a shorter period.

The following measures are to be taken:

1. A suitable procedure for managing requests for same day visits through a new visitor day pass should be implemented.

2. Reception staff should be empowered to apply their discretion, which may or may not result in them granting access, when considering requests from persons seeking brief, same day entry, and when rejecting application for membership due to incomplete credentials.

3. Guidance on the application of discretion should be provided by Managers. Decisions of a discretionary nature that on review we may not wish to be repeated would not result in sanction for the member of Reception staff.

4. Reception staff should refer to Helpdesk Supervisor or Duty Librarian, when on duty, for advice when unsure or in situations where referral might prevent a dispute over access from escalating.

5. Reception staff should continue to follow the Admissions Manual in processing requests for membership.

Changes to access arrangements will be made shortly after the Library Committee on 5th June.

Barry Croucher, Head of Help Services, IS User Services; 27/03/2013.
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The University provides access to almost 36,000 e-journal titles, but does not own this full collection. The journals fall broadly into 5 categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal source</th>
<th>Archival rights</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Print &amp; electronic – combined subscriptions</td>
<td>Print is usually retained when there are no archival rights.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Print is retained when required; or when long term archival access is not yet assured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Electronic only – subscriptions (Print is no longer purchased or retained)</td>
<td>Post cancellation access is covered by the licence, and archival rights are assured.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Extra checks are needed when titles transfer to a new publisher, to confirm archival rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Big Deal – extra content*</td>
<td>Typically, none.</td>
<td>If cancelled, no access</td>
<td>This category is the extra content gained via a Big Deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Databases**</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>If cancelled, no access</td>
<td>These are aggregated collections, leased from the supplier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This category is the additional content that is provided through a package or Big Deal, and it is unlikely that any print equivalents are owned. The University has agreements with most major publishers, where the fees include ownership of the University’s core set of subscribed titles, plus access to all other current titles from publisher. The terms vary, but in most cases, the University retains ownership of the core subscribed titles, but not the additional titles.

**Full text databases - These are aggregated databases, and typically will be subject specific, covering a high volume of current and older titles from a range of publishers. Access is leased for the duration of the subscription period, there are no ownership rights.

Archival rights to categories (2) and (3) should be assured by the terms of the agreement with the publisher or the supplier. As far as possible, agreements include assurance that the publisher works with LOCKSS and/or Portico.

**Perpetual Access – LOCKSS, CLOCKSS & Portico**

The University has agreements with LOCKSS and Portico, which are primarily preservation platforms for subscribed content. Portico has also reached agreement with some publishers to act as a host for post-cancellation access, where required. Both systems provide assurance that subscribed content is available to authorised users, in the event that publisher platforms or services fail. Both are subscription services, licensed via JISC.

CLOCKSS is a dark archive; content is only released when there is a major catastrophe. As well as being a member, the University of Edinburgh is one of a network of research institutions hosting the CLOCKSS archive, and is represented on the Board of Directors.
Perpetual Access to Print where we only have electronic subscriptions – UKRR

The University is a member of the UK Research Reserve (UKRR), a collaborative distributed collection of print journals that have been identified for retention for the nation’s future research needs. The collection seeks to retain two copies of a particular journal title within the partnership, and have one additional copy made available through the British Library’s Document Supply Centre for Inter-Library Loan. The partnership agreement is such that members must publicise the retention status of such titles within their online catalogues, and continue to store and care for these titles.

http://www.portico.org/digital-preservation/
http://www.lockssalliance.ac.uk/
http://www.clockss.org/clockss/Home
http://www.ukrr.ac.uk/
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RESEARCH DATA STORAGE AND MANAGEMENT (RDSM) Update

The Research Data Management initiative has continued since the last update on the 16th November, albeit with a delay in the release of funding for the storage and service development. The Steering Group with cross-College Representation, chaired by Professor Peter Clarke has met twice since then, to discuss the three pilot areas of work, and to approve the initiation of an awareness raising campaign.

The three pilots consist of:

1. Active Data Infrastructure: Testing access mechanisms to research filestore to ensure that the extra storage to be provided to researchers is accessible to their computers in useful ways.
2. DataShare Repository: Trialling new types of data sets, for example streaming video and large datasets in the DataShare repository of open data sets to ensure that it is flexible enough to offer a service to a broad range of disciplines.
3. DMPOnline: The Data Management Planning tool has been tested by a number of researchers to see if it asks the right questions, and where it could be tailored or improved to match local requirements. Revisions are now underway.

Alongside this work, the online Research Data MANTRA course for early career researchers has been completed and tested by the steering group. Four liaison librarians have also been trained about RDM and another four will begin next month. The awareness raising activities are concentrating on the need for good research data management knowledge and skills, the requirement by funders to manage data effectively, and the work being undertaken by the university in this area. These sessions are being jointly co-ordinated by Peter Clarke and Information Services. The first level run of these sessions (College management level) will be completed by the end of March.

Once final approval is given for the funding to implement the University’s Research Data Roadmap, work will commence on the delivery of final versions of the pilot systems, plus other supporting services and systems to provide a comprehensive and fit-for-purpose RDSM service.

John Scally, Chair, RDSM Implementation Group (IS)

The Research Data Management Roadmap and further information can be found here:

http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/about/strategy-planning/rdm-roadmap
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Images of the Lower Ground Floor, due for handover Monday 25th March 2013

Lower Ground Floor
The final phase of the Main Library Redevelopment Project is approaching completion with the Lower Ground floor due for handover on Monday 25th March. The repopulation of the floor will commence immediately thereafter with staff moves taking place between Tuesday 26th March & Wednesday 3rd April. Furniture installation and set-up will be complete on the Lower Ground Floor by Friday 29th March.

All moves will be carried out by Clockwork Removals and move dates are as follows:
- Tuesday 26th March - furniture moves from Floor 4 to LGF West Office
- Wednesday 27th March - staff moves from Floor 4 to LGF West Office
- Friday 29th March - Facilities moves from external portakabins to LGF
- Tuesday 2nd & Wednesday 3rd April - staff moves from Buccleuch Place to LGF East Office

Collections moves into the Lower Ground Floor will take place between Monday 8th April and Friday 10th May.

The Lower Ground Floor will house staff offices including meeting spaces, collections stores, and a staff cafe. There are no open access study areas on the Lower Ground Floor.

Floor 4 Completion of Study Space
Following the relocation of staff from the Floor 4 temporary office to the Lower Ground Floor work will commence to return the staff office back into open access study space. Once completed, this reconfiguration will provide an additional 40 study spaces on Floor 4.

There will be some disruption on Floor 4 from Monday 25th March for a number of weeks due to furniture and staff moves and the reconfiguration of the floor. Notices will be displayed advising users of potential disruption.

Main Library Lift Replacement Works
The evacuation lift is due for completion on Friday 22nd March. The final lift will not be decommissioned until Monday 15th April to help relieve pressure on the lifts during the moves from Floor 4 to the Lower Ground Floor. The final lift is due for completion end June 2013.

All this work brings to an end the long-running MLRP.

Lesley Bryson
Darwin Learning & Teaching Cluster: re-development of study space

This project will redevelop the upper floor of the former Darwin Library at King’s Buildings to provide quality study space, which will complement that available in the Noreen and Kenneth Murray Library, KB Centre and JCMC Learning & Teaching Cluster. The library closed in Summer 2012 and funding was approved by Estates Committee last September. However, it has recently become necessary for Estates Committee to review its decision in the light of the School of Biological Sciences’ estate strategy, which envisages a limited life-span for the two storey former Darwin Library building. At its meeting on 27 March, Estates Committee agreed to a significantly reduced budget for this project. IS, College and Estates & Buildings colleagues will now resume work on this project, with the aim of having it completed for the start of next session.

Richard Battersby

Royal Infirmary Library: improving study spaces

As part of the Chancellor's Building Amenities Refurbishment project we are looking to increase the floor space available in the Royal Infirmary Library at Little France, for use as study space, by removing 2 bays of journals which are available online.

We are also looking at replacing the existing large bank of study tables with smaller ones and arrange them in ways which provide more private, useable study space. The space will remain as one for quiet study but will provide different configurations of desks and have some screened areas for increased privacy for students.

The library project is currently being scoped and will be managed by the CB Refurbishment Group with input from IS Consultancy staff. As yet there is no timescale for the work, but the hope is that it can be completed before the start of the next academic year and contribute to the overall enhancement of the Chancellor's Building for students. This initiative has the support of IS and the College.

Irene McGowan

Richard Battersby, Deputy Director, User Services Division
28 March 2013

m/April 2013 Library Committee paper
MINUTES

Attendees:

Dr John Scally (Director of Library and Collections) (Ex Officio) (Chair)

Mrs Fiona Brown (nominee of Library staff) User Services Division, IS

Prof. David Fergusson (Convener of College Library Committee – Humanities & Social Science)

Mr Maxwell Greenberg (Undergraduate Representative)

Dr Anna Kenway (College of Science & Engineering)

Mr George MacKenzie (nominated by the University Court)

Dr Richard Mayr (College of Science & Engineering)

Prof. Simon Parsons (Convener of S&E College Library Committee)

Mrs Janet Rennie (College of Humanities & Social Science)

Dr Hamish Ross (College of Humanities & Social Science)

Mr Aloysius Ssennyonjo (Postgraduate Representative)

In Attendance:

Mr Richard Battersby (CSE Consultancy Team Representative)

Ms Susan Graham (University Records Manager)

Mr Stuart Lewis (Head of Digital Library & Acting Deputy Director of Library and Collections)

Mr Abdul Majothi (HSS Consultancy Team Representative)

Ms Irene McGowan (MVM Consultancy Team Representative)

Apologies received in advance:

Vice-Principal Jeff Haywood (Convener - nominated by the Senatus Academicus)

Professor David J. Finnegan (nominated by the University Court)

Mrs Elspeth Currie (College of Medicine & Veterinary Medicine)

Dr Steven Morley (Convener of College Library Committee – Medicine & Veterinary Medicine)

Apologies noted at the meeting:

Mr Andrew Burnie (Vice President Academic Affairs)

Dr Sue Rigby (nominated by the University Court)

Minutes: Laura Ingram (PA to John Scally)
1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES – JS

John Scally welcomed the Committee and noted that he would be chairing today as Jeff Haywood has had to attend another meeting at short notice. All apologies are noted above.

2. NOMINATIONS TO LIBRARY COMMITTEE – JS

The following people were nominated at University Court on 5 November 2012:

- Professor David Finnegan (extended to 31 July 2014)
- Dr Sue Rigby (to 31 July 2015)

3. CONVENOR AND DIRECTOR OF LIBRARY & COLLECTIONS BUSINESS – JS

There was no business to report.

For Discussion:

4. COLLECTIONS POLICY – KEY POLICY STATEMENTS – PAPER A

John introduced Paper A as the second draft of Key Policy Statements. Points raised:

**Item 11:** Where we have **guaranteed long-term access to electronic journals**, the **print copy of the same title will be assessed for transfer, relegation or disposal.**

David Fergusson queried whether “long-term access to electronic journals” indicated that we would dispose of the only hard copies? John said this may happen depending on the reliability of long-term digital access and the discipline area. For example, in medicine the disposal of print when electronic access can be assured is well advanced. In other areas, the move is statelier and will take longer.

Richard Mayr queried what is meant by “long-term”? John clarified that this meant “in perpetuity or perpetual access” to electronic content. Irene McGowan reassured the Committee that we would always have access to the **content** in some form (via collaborative arrangements like Portico, post-cancellation access to publishers’ journals, etc.). She noted that much care is being taken in the management of journals, including moving low-use items to a separate storage space (rather than disposing of them straight away).

Dr Mayr requested that the Paper be amended to clarify in detail what is meant by “guaranteed in perpetuity”, and to allay worries of post-cancellation administrative costs spiralling over time. John emphasised that there has been no evidence over recent years to indicate that admin charges will spike. Richard Battersby added that, for many current journals, print options are no longer available in any case and we have to opt for electronic.

John acknowledged the points made and agreed to look again at the wording of the Key Policy Statements.

**Item 1:** The Library will provide a dynamic, relevant and evolving collection of resources to support teaching and research in the University and, where possible, in the wider community. This will be supported by established as well as new methods of acquisition.

Janet Rennie requested that the tense in the following statement be changed from “could” to “would”: “An established model could include academic purchase recommendations; new methods could include patron driven acquisition”. John agreed.
Item 8: Donations, or internal transfers (e.g. School collection transfers), of books, manuscripts and archives will be assessed using selection criteria and/or records retention schedules that will be applied before accepting material.

Some concern was noted as to the need to be aware of how we are treating donors, including in the wording of documents/policies. In this instance, it was felt that it might not be reasonable to ask potential donors to check the relevance of their items to current teaching/research practice, and that it would not be realistic to expect them to have access to this information. This type of demand, as worded above, does not sound welcoming or encouraging to potential donors.

John clarified that this statement is not aimed at the larger level of donor, but rather at the numerous small donations of, for example, second-hand material, which can cause a high level of administrative work and issues with storage space. It is imperative that some sort of ‘barrier’ is put in place to prevent the excessive donation of unusable items which lead to this.

Susan Graham requested that the second bullet point of Item 8 of the Paper (“Donors are asked to complete such checking, as guided, before submitting material for consideration”) be reworded in order to clarify the issue, along the lines of “Donors are requested to contact the University to establish relevance”, rather than implying that they are expected to do the research themselves. John agreed.

Item 9: Deposits will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances and under agreed conditions.

George Mackenzie queried whether we have turned away any deposits because they were temporary, rather than permanent donations? John reported that, generally speaking, we had not, but that conversation with potential depositors is turned to the option of donation where possible. Ultimately, we have minimal influence over when/if depositors sell their items off, either in whole or in part. George reflected that a common policy across the UK Universities would be very desirable.

Item 5: Heritage and Special Collections are acquired according to existing collection strengths and research and teaching priorities;

and

Item 6: The Library collects and preserves the intellectual output of the University in manuscript, print and electronic format, through services such as the Edinburgh Research Archive (ERA), the Current Research Information System (PURE), and the University Archives.

Susan Graham requested that some wording be worked into Item 5 to cover the presentation of the University’s history as well as its intellectual output. John felt that this may have been covered by Item 6’s linking to the University’s Archive Policy, and clarified that these points are intended to sit in front of existing policies, but he agreed to check that Items 5 and 6 correspond with the Archive Policy, and to address any issues by bringing back reworded statements to the Library Committee in draft for approval. This was agreed.

Action: (Item 11) John Scally to look at the wording of Paper A regarding definitions of “long-term” and “in perpetuity”, and to address potential future administrative costs (subscriptions, etc.) in this regard, with a particular emphasis on the potentially differing impacts across the various disciplines / categories of research.

Action: (Item 1) John to amend wording in Item 1 of Paper A from “An established model could include academic purchase recommendations; new methods
could include patron driven acquisition” to “An established model would include academic purchase recommendations; new methods could include patron driven acquisition”.

Action: (Item 8) John to amend wording in Bullet Point 2 of Item 8 to clarify that “Donors are requested to contact the University to establish relevance”, rather than implying that they are expected to do the research themselves.

Action: (Items 5/6) John to check that Items 5 and 6 correspond with the Archive Policy, and to address any issues by bringing back reworded statements to the Library Committee in draft for approval.

5. IMPLEMENTING RCUK POLICY ON OPEN ACCESS – PAPER B

John Scally introduced the paper (Paper B), our response to the Finch Report, and he underlined that this is a very challenging area to understand and to navigate, having caused considerable debate across Higher Education as to what the Policy refers and how to apply it without excessive cost and bureaucracy. The University of Edinburgh has been involved in several of these discussions. From close examination of the RCUK Policy, it appears that RCUK have looked at the administration of the Wellcome grants in depth, and echoed this here to some degree.

The main issue at present is how to handle the one-off grant we have been allocated by RCUK-Bis to prepare ourselves for the implementation of the Policy in April. We are in the process of determining what percentage of the overall costs of the criteria imposed on us this will cover, but it is unlikely to be 100%.

John handed over to Stuart Lewis, who gave a brief explanation of the difference between the “Gold” and “Green” publishing routes, as follows:

- “Gold” = Researchers publish as normal, but they pay the publisher a fee to make the article freely available on the internet, normally via the publisher website.

- “Green” = Post peer-review, the researcher will submit their article to the publisher, but also to the University, who will make it freely available at no charge following an embargo period (6-12 months, normally).

Stuart noted that the above pertains only to RCUK-funded research, and not all University research.

The Committee was also asked to note that monographs and non-peer reviewed journal outputs are also currently out with the scope of the Policy.

Stuart informed the Committee of the five-year Roadmap which RCUK have set out for UK universities. It is anticipated by them that, at the end of the five years, 75% of RCUK-funded research should be available via the Gold route, and 25% via the Green route. However, we are not expected to meet this target straight away. For example, in the first year, we must aim for 45% of peer-reviewed output via the Gold route. Further discussion needs to be had around how to determine how many articles are published this way. This could be done by estimating how many papers are published per year and by looking at RCUK’s own figures. Both methods give us a rough estimate of 1,200 to 1,300 papers per year to be published via the Gold route. It seems likely that the grant will cover this level of output in Years 1 and 2, assuming a 20% contribution in addition from the University (as per the usual contribution level, although the exact sources have yet to be decided). Many institutions have fed back
to RCUK the difficulties in finding this extra 20% funding, especially as APC costs cannot go into grant requests after 1st April 2013.

Anna Kenway and Simon Parsons pointed out that much of the University’s output is at least part-funded by RCUK, and enquired what would happen in the case of articles part-funded by multiple sources? Stuart and John agreed that other grant sources would still be used, but suggested that the RCUK element could be pro-rated when calculating the number of papers to be published via the Gold route, although the University of RCUK would need to decide on this.

John emphasised that, at this stage, we are pinning some numbers down in an initial attempt to see how close we can get to compliance, but that RCUK are allowing some leeway so long as we aim for the targets (i.e. 45% in Year 1), even if we do not meet them. It is important to provide them with full and accurate data as to the level we do reach and why. Internally, it will be essential to track all related spending so that we have a clear picture of what we have and have not been able to cover and why. We will be looking closely at the Green publishing route, but do need to ensure we come as close to the Gold target as possible.

John noted that the Research Policy Group will also receive a version of this report on 19th December. In the meantime, he and Stuart are very happy to receive views on the draft figures suggested, as these are still very much in draft stage and any firm data that can confirm or correct their data would be valued.

Stuart informed the Committee that Information Services will be using some of the block grant to employ project staff to ensure that we subscribe to relevant Open Access Research schemes and work with suppliers of the PURE system to ensure the accessibility of displayed data, etc. It will also be necessary to employ some element of project management to cover the project and the periods immediately preceding and following implementation.

As detailed in Paper B, Stuart noted that papers must include details of the funding that supported the research, and a statement on how the underlying research materials – such as data, samples or models – can be accessed. RCUK will now mandate from 1st April 2013 that all authors acknowledge the research councils as the source or part source of the funding for their research. This intersects with the University’s research data initiative and is included in the programme of work described in the Research Data Management Roadmap. Stuart invited the Committee to raise any questions about the above / Paper B.

Simon Parsons queried where the £830,000 figure came from, in the sentence, “The pump-priming grant will be followed by annual block grants of £830,000 in 2013/14 and £977,000 in 2014/15 to be used specifically for the payment of APCs for RCUK funded or partially funded peer-reviewed scholarly outputs in journals”. Stuart responded that this is an estimate based on the average number of annual publications, the number of these that are RCUK-funded, and cost of an APC. As we must make a return each year of all Gold-published papers, the information on the spending in this area by all RCUK-funded bodies will be publicly available and it will be possible to compare and refine the figures in the future, as well as to clearly see what percentage of the money is going to the publisher.

Simon queried how we determine which papers are published via the Gold route? Stuart gave various possible options, including (1) first-come-first-served; (2) letting the colleges decide on 45% of their own output; (3) looking at the REF-return; (4) publishing Green where possible, with the remainder as Gold. These ideas will be presented to the Research Policy Group on 19th December, and feedback from Library Committee members is invited in advance of this.

John added that, at the recent RCUK conference in Swindon, people were generally quite reluctant to discuss how they will be handling this issue. Some bodies do not have access to the administrative systems / PURE that we have. There has been much discussion
amongst University Librarians regarding this area, particularly given the short period available for implementation.

David Fergusson acknowledged that we have no choice but to comply, but felt that there are high risks involved, with large amounts of money going to enrich publishers, one danger being that the criteria will be reviewed / withdrawn a few years down the line, after a lot of our resources have been spent on this. It was noted that it is particularly risky for Humanities as there is less emphasis on publishing in peer-reviewed journals. There is an additional worry that other necessary items of expenditure may be neglected if the RCUK Open Access Policy is prioritised financially and/or if the number of papers to be published has been under-estimated. David queried whether a risk assessment had been undertaken?

John noted that there has been no formal risk assessment as yet, but agreed that this would be a difficult area to navigate over the next few years. He clarified that RCUK’s position at Swindon was largely that we should manage the process within our existing resources, and noted that there is definitely some unease in the University around new administrative procedures/resources that may be required. If the Library is managing the process, they will ensure that all associated administrative processes are as light touch and automated as possible.

Stuart pointed out that RCUK are looking at their spend on the Open Access Policy as a small percentage (less than 1%) of their overall annual research spend. However, this is not ‘extra’ money in their pot, but money that would otherwise have been directed towards funding research.

Janet Rennie noted that the Research Policy Group will confirm how the Pump Priming Grant of £609,000 will be spent, but was concerned that several of the ideas in Paper B involve staffing costs. Stuart replied that some of these will be temporary. Concern was raised as to how effective temporary staff could be when the short training time is taken into consideration. Stuart noted that we will have to work within the given parameters; but that the Paper is just presenting ideas at this stage and that more dialogue around this is required.

John noted that we have been directed by Research Policy Group (RPG). Janet requested that the Research Policy Group be asked for some flexibility to here to allow some spend on Gold, possibly to include retrospective Gold publication of some papers. John agreed to put forward this proposal.

John asked members how widely awareness of this issue had penetrated within the Colleges. Members confirmed a general sense of awareness, but not of the intricacies of how the policy will be applied or how/whether it will affect the Colleges’ own budgets. Simon Parsons felt that there is a need to reassure Colleges regarding this.

John reiterated that RCUK will not be too strict with us over the first two or three years if we do not meet the official targets, so we do have some time to adjust. He thanked the Library Committee for their support and assistance over this issue and confirmed that this topic will be raised again at future Library Committee meetings as this forum provides an ideal intersection for several on-going dialogues, particularly highlighting the varying needs of the different Colleges.

John Scally thanked Stuart for all his work on this matter, and reiterated his thanks to members for their contributions to the discussions.

**Action:** Any members of Library Committee who feel they can provide firm data to confirm or negate the draft figures suggested above, as well as views on how to determine which papers are published via the Gold route as opposed to Green, to contact Stuart Lewis and John Scally to discuss before 19th December.
Action: College members to speak to their Deans to discuss possible deliverables that could fit under the remit of the Pump Priming Grant.

Reports:

6. MAIN LIBRARY OPENING HOURS – PAPER C

John noted that this item has been raised on the agenda in response to the Student Representatives’ recent concerns, and asked Aloysius Ssennyonjo and Max Greenberg to take the Paper back to Andrew Burnie (they agreed to do this).

Max acknowledged the paper and stated his appreciation for the work that has been done on this issue, and the Library’s willingness to extend opening hours in the Main Library. He felt that the recommendations made in the paper are excellent, and will ensure a significant improvement to students’ experience.

John thanked Max for his feedback and, whilst noting some financial restraints, agreed to keep the dialogue open and confirm next steps within a couple of weeks.

There were no further comments on this Paper.

Max Greenberg left the meeting.

Action: Aloysius Ssennyonjo and Max Greenberg to take Paper C back to Andrew Burnie for his attention.

(Continued overleaf)

7. COLLECTIONS REVIEW UPDATE – PAPER D

John presented this report and noted that it is hoped that a decision will be made shortly as to the selection of the e-book supplier (patron-driven acquisition – Point 2 of the Paper), with whom we will partner on the pilot, following discussions with the e-book aggregator this week. The pilot, which comes into effect at the start of January 2013, will be reviewed next year, but it is anticipated that we will acquire approximately 2,200 e-books and will therefore be able to compile data on their usage.

It was noted that the CUP bundle will be paid as a one-off initial payment from the Collections Review e-books PDA strand. David Fergusson commented that this is very good news.

Janet responded that she was also happy with this news, but was concerned that it would not be possible to spend all of the Collections Review money within the timeframe available. John reported that Elize (Rowan) is confident that this will be possible, and that it is hoped that it will be possible to stick closely to the given criteria.

Hamish Ross expressed some concern that Item 3 (students’ requests) is not going so well. John acknowledged that we do not have a full set of data for Semester 1 as yet, but that approximately 80 students have made requests so far this year, and he would be interested to look at any underspend in this area. Richard Battersby added that spending is being monitored on a continuous basis, and so we will know of any potential underspend well in advance of the end of the financial year. It was agreed that any underspend be used for pressing needs in the Colleges.
Aloysius Ssennyonjo raised the issue that sometimes (peak times of the academic calendar, etc.), there are not enough copies of a book to go round, but that it’s not possible to request one via Interlibrary loans as there are deemed to be enough copies in circulation to meet the perceived need. Janet reminded Aloysius that books can be reserved and called back in if necessary.

John responded that Library staff do look at solutions to bottlenecks on an on-going basis (e-books are one such solution), but he would be pleased to look further into this issue (and respond within the constraints of the budget) if Aloysius could provide him with data on specific issues and areas of concern.

**Action:** John to report back to Library Committee with more data on the Collections Review expenditure as it becomes available.

8. **MAIN LIBRARY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT (MLRP) REPORT – PAPER E**

Paper E (for noting only) provides a brief update on the Main Library Redevelopment Project, including Main Library usage, construction and redevelopment work, and on-going facilities and services issues. John noted that the time slippage is due to the unforeseen issues arising at Easter.

John invited the Committee to raise any issues for discussion. There were none. The report was formally noted.

9. **ACQUISITION HIGHLIGHTS – PAPER F**

Paper F gives brief descriptions of some of the more recent acquisitions across Library collections as it was thought to be beneficial to be aware of some of the collections held by the Library across the disciplines. John asked the Committee whether an annual report of the same would be useful. This was agreed and the following suggestions were made:

1. (Simon Parsons) - It would be interesting to see more of the items mentioned, perhaps on display in the general exhibition area downstairs in the Main Library.

2. (Janet Rennie) – It could be an excellent opportunity for students to curate an exhibition as a placement project. John noted that there is a three-year funded post for a Student Support Officer to look at just this type of opportunity for students.

3. (John Scally) - A future Library Committee meeting could be held upstairs so that some items can be viewed by members during the meeting.

**Action:** To discuss the possibility of Library exhibitions and student placement curation projects at the next Library Committee meeting.

10. **REPORTS: COLLEGES AND EUSA – FOR NOTING**

The Report from the College of Science and Engineering Library Committee was formally noted (most aspects raised have been covered by today’s agenda).

**Action:** College members to formally add items to future Library Committee agendas, and to provide similar reports where appropriate (rather than use “Any Other Business”).

**Minutes and Matters Arising:**
11. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING HELD ON 10TH OCTOBER, 2012

The minutes of the last meeting were formally approved, and these will be posted onto the Library Committee homepage shortly.

12. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising.

13. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no further business.

14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be held on **Wednesday, 10th April 2013 at 2pm**, in Room 1.07 in the Main Library, George Square.

It was noted that the subsequent meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 5th June 2013 at 2pm will go ahead despite the clash with Senate.

*Please note that the meeting previously scheduled for Wednesday, 6th February 2013 has been cancelled as previously agreed by Library Committee.*