MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 8th DECEMBER 2010 AT 2 P.M
IN ROOM 1.11, 1st FLOOR MEETING SUITE, MAIN LIBRARY, GEORGE SQUARE

Present:  Professor Jeff Haywood (Convenor)
          Professor David Fergusson
          Professor Dai Hounsell
          Professor David Finnegan
          Professor Kenneth Boyd
          Dr Anna Kenway
          Dr Alex Murdoch
          Mrs Fiona Brown
          Mrs Janet Rennie
          Ms Philippa Sheail

          Mrs Sheila Cannell, Director of Library Services

In Attendance:  Mr Simon Bains
                Ms Irene McGowan
                Dr John Scally
                Ms Louise Hallows (Secretary)
                Mr Richard Battersby
                Mr Abdul Majothi

Apologies:  Professor Graham Pettigrew
            Professor John Moncrieff
            Professor Bonnie Webber
            Mr George MacKenzie
            Mr Alan Hunter
            Mr Andrew Burnie
            Mr Kolos Kantor
            Mr Dan Clinkman
            Ms Stevie Wise
            Mrs Susan Graham

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.

19. Welcome
   The Convenor welcomed Philippa Sheail to the Committee, as representative for Library and Collections. He also thanked Professor Boyd for his contribution to the Committee over many years. Professor Boyd would be standing down as representative for MVM following his retirement.

20. Convenor and Director of Library Services Business
   The Convenor informed the Committee about the planning guidance which forecasts required savings of -5%, -5%, and -3% over the next 3 years. However, this could look more like -7%, -
7%, -2% in real terms. He noted that Information Services would be having planning consultation meetings with each Colleges, Support Groups and EUSA early in 2011.

For discussion:

21. Paper A, Library Committee terms of reference (TOR)

The Convenor presented this paper which is a revised draft produced by Katherine Novosel (Head of Court Services) of the terms of reference for the Library Committee, to comply with Knowledge Strategy Committee (KSC) regulations (which reports to Court). The paper is subject to approval by KSC and Court. The Committee were invited to comment on the ordinances within the paper.

Mrs Rennie noted that there was no reference to strategic development. It was agreed that there should be a reference to setting and monitoring strategic direction in Section 4 (Remit).

With this amendment, the Committee approved the submission of the TOR to KSC for approval.

Action: Mrs Cannell to prepare formal wording for revising TOR.

22. Paper B, Materials budget: development of an academic strategy

Mrs Cannell presented this paper which is intended to provide data and comment towards the development an academic strategy in relation to the materials budget. The materials budget represents approximately 25% of the core IS budget. Therefore, it is essential that resource is spent wisely to the benefit of learning, teaching and research. The Committee were asked to comment on the questions posed within the paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comments by Committee members:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact of an expenditure reduction on research outputs</td>
<td>• Reductions will impact Colleges at different levels and in different ways, and it will be necessary to address issues and understand priorities at the School level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is also important to acknowledge that the budget is supplemented to different levels across the Colleges and Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of deficits in the collections</td>
<td>• Measuring any negative impact on research caused by the library materials budget is difficult and can only be understand at School level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• However, it was agreed that there must be a default level of deficit which will impact on the University’s research outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of areas where more value can be extracted from exiting expenditure on library materials.</td>
<td>• Review the usage of online journal subscriptions (but this can only be carried out at the University, not at the School level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding the bundles: consideration of whether it could be more financially sound to discontinue bundles which include low used journals, to prefer a model in which and could articles in these lower used journals be licensed individually?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Making decisions about what not to buy | • It could be useful to ask Schools what they would do with 10% more and 10% less to get an assessment of the real position  
• This is easier for journals as those which are lesser used could be discontinued. However, some low use journals may be very important to specific researchers.  
• This is more difficult for books, since items that may not have been borrowed but only consulted in the Library, makes this difficult.  
• Reductions in monograph purchases could be considered, with the option of purchasing at a later date if required—although this is not always possible.  
• Would it be more cost effective for academics to personally buy journals and claim the expenses back—however, this may be contrary to the contract in place.  
• It is very difficult to forecast the level of future usage to ensure maximum value, based on existing usage.  
• Reductions now seem to be possible, and may not cause an immediate problem, but will cause problems in the future. |
| Committee support of maximising value through collaboration, even though this may reduce choice | • The Committee supported collaborative purchasing schemes. |
| Suitability of the collection for research and learning | • There is little research on the impact of collections in research and learning.  
• It is particularly important to consider PGT expectations and the needs of Distance Education; particularly where some items may not be available electronically. |
| Open access as a long term strategy | • There are still some areas e.g. Physics and Mathematics, where open access publishing is the norm, but the purchase of journals is still required by the researchers, because of peer review and due to the need to cite the published version. |
| Impact of NLS acquisitions reductions (75%) | • This will be communicated to Schools who depend on NLS materials to consider. |
| Benchmarking against Russell Group Universities: Is Edinburgh’s position reflective? | • Benchmarking against specific disciplines of other institutions would be more reflective. |

**Action:** The paper to be sent to Colleges and College Library Committees for consultation.
23. **Paper C, Satisfaction and benchmarking for library services**

This paper summarised questions relating to the Library from various national surveys, including the National Student Survey (NSS), International Student Barometer (ISB), LibQual, and benchmarking against Russell Group libraries. It was noted that some of these results are difficult to interpret, making addressing the issues complex. The Committee were asked to suggest ways of interpreting the data, and to suggest other ways of gathering data on the requirements of different library users. The Committee raised the following points:

- Dr Kenway queried whether users were considering the physical library in their responses. Mr Battersby suggested that surveys amalgamate user satisfaction of the digital and the physical library. It would be beneficial to disaggregate these for better understanding.
- The Convenor sought to consider the segmentation of the market, and looking at the reasons behind some results for example some students coming from higher ranked Institutions, who would rank Edinburgh not as good, in comparison to their previous University.
- Professor Fergusson highlighted that more reflective results may be received following the completion of the Main Library redevelopment, because currently this may dominate some respondents’ thinking about the Library.

**Reports:**

24. **Paper D, Research Publications Service update**

Mr Bains provided an update on the current status of the Research Publications Service. The planned procurement of a new system (PURE) in the current year is an important development. Much of the data required will be gathered on the existing Publications Repository (PR), and then migrated to the new system.

It is now planned to purchase Thomson InCites from the material budget to help with gathering data. Some data will be imported through this system and this will help reduce the workload of research administrators. However, research administrators will continue to be asked to check this data for accuracy, to load data not available from InCites, and to add full text were appropriate. Research administrators will be notified when this will be possible, and training and support will be available.

There was some concern about whether this will be ready in time for REF preparations. The library staff are very aware of the importance of the REF and will be working to get the data prepared in good time, but this is now dependent on the implementation of PURE.

Regular monthly updates on this service will be circulated. Discussions will be held with School and College research administrators to understand individual needs. James Toon (RPS Service Manager) will co-ordinate, and carry out these discussions. Mrs Cannell suggested that it would be appropriate to provide a demonstration to the Committee of the new system when available.

**Action:** Mr Bains to arrange for demonstration of new system when available.

25. **Paper E, Main Library redevelopment: revised plans**

Mrs Cannell described the revised plans relating to the 4th floor of the Main Library. The 4th floor will now house study spaces and shelving, Staff will now be housed on the Lower Ground floor. This decision has been approved by the Estates Committee. It is possible there will be a delay of one year in the completion of the LG floor. Staff who cannot be housed in the Main Library will potentially be accommodated in Dalhousie Land and JCM—discussions are currently ongoing.
Also included in the paper were statistics on the usage of the Main Library, post-redevelopment. Students have expressed concerns about finding seats, but headcounts indicate that seats are available. However, many users prefer to use particular types of seats at particular times of the year and users may “reserve” seats and this means they are unavailable to others. The Library is working with EUSA to address these issues.

26. **Paper F, Main Library redevelopment update**
   The Committee were asked to note the regular update on the redevelopment.

27. **Paper G, King’s Building Library update**
   Mr Battersby provided the update on the development of the KB Library. Work will begin at the end of January, and is expected to be completed by spring 2012.

28. **New Veterinary Library: verbal update**
   Ms McGowan informed the committee that final decisions for the Veterinary Library are currently being addressed. Work to confirm the library stock which will be housed in the Library and that which will be moved to the Library Research Annexe will be confirmed shortly.

29. **College Library Committee Reports:**

   **Humanities & Social Science** – The College Library Committee will be renamed from the 1st January 2011 to the College Library and Academic Computing Committee. Sian Bayne has been appointed as Dean for Digital Scholarship.

   **Medicine & Veterinary Medicine** – Thanks were expressed from Professor Boyd for the time he has sat on the Committee.

   **Science & Engineering** – Work is focussing on the KB Library, Research Publications Service and the materials budget. These will be discussed at the next College Library Committee.

30. **EUSA Report** – There was no representative from EUSA present. The Convenor thanked the representatives for their recent work particularly in relation to the Main Library redevelopment in, providing an efficient liaison channel and adhering to confidentiality protocols.

**Minutes and matters arising:**

31. **Paper H, Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 20th October 2010 were approved.**

32. **Paper M1, Action log from last meeting:** Only one action is outstanding relating to the confirmation of an LRA2 Advisory Group.

33. **Any other of Business:** Nothing to note.

34. **Date of next meeting:** Tuesday 8th February 2011, Room 1.11, 1st Floor Meeting Suite, Main Library, 2.00pm